

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

A Bi-Monthly Journal Devoted to the Interests of the
Evangelical Lutheran Church.

EDITED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOLUME VII.

Columbus, Ohio:
The Lutheran Book Concern.
1887.

INDEX TO VOLUME VII.

NO. 1.

	Page.
The New Theology, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	1
Church Authority, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D.....	20
Capital and Labor, by Prof. Theo Mees	44
Mission Work among the Jews, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D...	57

NO. 2.

The New Theology, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette... ..	65
The Union of Church and State, by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn.....	97
The Old Testament in the Light of the New, translated by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D.. ..	107

NO. 3.

The New Theology, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette...	129
Reason: Its Place in the Kingdom of Nature and Grace, by Rev. M. H. Hockman	151
The Use of Excitation in Discourse, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D.....	161
Art in Public Worship, translated by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..	172

NO. 4.

The Word We Preach, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	193
Ambition, by Rev. O. S. Oglesby.....	203
Art in Public Worship, translated by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..	213
Some Qualities of Effective Preaching.....	247

NO. 5.

That the Man of God may be Perfect, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..	321
The Historic Churches of the East, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	345
Martha and Mary, (from the German) by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette ..	355
A Complete Life, by J. Ker, (from the Expositor).....	367
Homiletical.....	383

NO. 6.

Harmony of the Gospels, Etc., by Rev. B. F. Schillinger.....	385
Latest Events upon the Jewish Missionary Work, Etc., trans- lated by Rev. L. H. Schuh	399
The Doctrine of the Real Presence in the Ante-Nicene Church, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	411
A Movement that Needs Watching, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	447

COLUMBUS

THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.

JANUARY, 1887.

No. 1.

“THE NEW THEOLOGY.”

FIRST ARTICLE.

To have made the person of Christ the central and starting point in dogmatical theology is by the modern school claimed to be a decided advance on the systems of the past; and to the gratification felt on account of it, there seems to be no bounds among them. By this change of base they at the very outset expected to be able both, to modify and correct some of the old doctrines, as also to arrive at some entirely new results. According to the adage: *Was man gern will glaubt man gern*, these expectations, they say, have in part at least been realized already; and there is no telling what things the “improved methods” now employed may yet hold in store for us. That the Son of God would have become incarnate, even if man had not sinned; that the life and death of Christ are not vicarious in the accepted sense of the term; that there is no need for God to be reconciled to men, but that men need to be reconciled to God; that imputed sin and imputed righteousness are in reality nothing more than empty conceptions, but yet fraught with much mischief to the cause of religion; that faith saves as an incorporative and sanctifying power rather than as an apprehending means; that the heathen dead,

and others situated like them and for similar reasons, have Gospel opportunities offered them;—these are the more prominent among the doctrinal achievements boasted of by the “*Modern gläubige Theologie*” of Germany, and as they are repeated by the “*New Theology*,”* as it styles itself, in our own land. According to the terminology of the old-school theologians, whatever is “*new*” in doctrine is strange, strange to the analogy of faith and the Scriptures, and therefore heretical. And in this sense the prevailing theology of the age very properly styles itself as “*The New*.” In the ordinary sense of the word, however, its effusions can be said to be no more new than they are true. Old vinegar and stale is made fresh and somewhat sweetened; then, put into new bottles, it is brought into the market of the Church, so to speak, and the cry is raised that now for the first time is the pure wine of God’s own vintage offered to the people of God. And thus, under the firm-name of “*The New Theology*,” do articles find a ready acceptance which, were they offered properly branded,† might be considered by many as

* Which has its seat at “*Andover*,” one of the leading theol. Seminaries of the Congregationalists.

† a) The incarnation of the Son of God aside from the fall of man was already taught by *Rupert of Deutz*, *Richard of St. Victor* and by *Duns Scotus* and his school. In this connection, though too good for the company, *John Wessel* may also be named. When *Schaberlein*, said to be the reviver of this theory, opens the list with *Irenaeus*, it were well that the proof accompanied the assertion. “*Being a Master, therefore, He also possessed the age of a Master, not despising or evading any condition of humanity, nor setting aside in Himself that law which He had appointed for the human race, but sanctifying every age, by that period corresponding to it which belonged to Himself. For He came to save all through means of Himself—all, I say, who through Him are born again to God—infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men.*” *Heresies* book II., c. 22, 4. These words certainly do not justify the assertion of S.; nor do we find any that might justify it.

b) The vicarious character of Christ’s mission was already flatly denied by *Abaelard*, the father of rationalism, by *Lombardus* and many others, who would see in Christ nothing higher than an *Exemplar* and an *Exemplum* for us to aspire to and follow.

c) The doctrine of original sin being in great part denied by *Pelagius* and utterly rejected by *Socinus* and their respective schools, and self-righteousness being placed by them in a corresponding measure for salvation through faith, and this wholly by

altogether too old for any use in this present nineteenth century.

With the person of Christ as the fundamental doctrine to start out with, better results might have been expected. And such, no doubt, would have been secured had the boasted change of base been accompanied by a change of mind and method on the part of the school, which claim to have righted and given proper balance to the old system of dogmas.* But as long as men are imbued with a spirit of gnosticism and take a metaphysical rather than a saving interest in the solution of theological problems, and in order to do this adopt for their working principle Scripture and Reason—not to say, Reason first and then Scripture—that long the truth must suffer, be the starting point taken never so correct. Besides, it is a debatable question whether, even in this last respect, any real improvement has been made on the old order of treatment. Is it not the case after all that, while the old theologians accepted as a postulate the great mystery of godliness, God is manifest in the flesh, and treated this as the sum and substance to which all truth was to be referred, the moderns look upon the same mystery as a proposition—though as the fundamental and all-controlling one, yet as a proposition—that is capable of comprehension, admits of development, and that stands in need of rational proof? Be this as it may: the fact is that the faulted method has produced by far the better results. To judge by the respective doctrines to which they have led, it would seem that the old way is still the best.

the operation of God—certainly the "*New Theology*" can have nothing new to offer in this respect, unless it be more insidious forms.

d) The newest fiction is at the same time the oldest; for *Clement of Alexandria* held that the Lord preached the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles in hades; and that "straightway, on the presentation of the truth, they also repented of their previous conduct." *Miscellanies* VI. c. 6.

I. THE INCARNATION.

In the first place: the notion that the Son of God has become incarnate on other grounds and for other purposes than those of a soteric nature only, is at best a mere hypothesis put forward by speculative theology. The Scriptures teach nothing of the kind; nor do they furnish any premises from which such inferences might be drawn. They expressly declare the saving of sinners to the glory of God to be the object of the incarnation. So persistent, direct and unmistakably clear is their testimony on this point as almost to force the conclusion that salvation is the one and exclusive end of this the greatest of all divine mysteries and miracles. All the prophecies of the Messiah's coming, and the hopes they awakened in the hearts of the people receiving them; the entire history concerning the Christ that is come, and the faith of millions built on it; every name of the wonderful God-man, His whole work and His every word—all assign to Him in His relation to mankind the place of a Savior, of the one Savior, and declare this and this only to be His divinely appointed mission on earth. "Thou shalt call His name *Jesus*—says the angel of annunciation to Mary—, for He shall save His people from their sins." Matt. 1, 21; comp. John 3, 16; Gal. 4, 4-5, etc. His own testimony on this point is among others of the same import; for "the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." Matt. 20, 28. "And we have seen—writes St. John—and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the Savior of the world." I. c. 4, 14. And again: "For this purpose—εἰς τὸν τόπον . . . ἦν—the Son of God was manifested, that He might destroy the works of the devil;" and v. 5:

"ye know that He was manifested to take away our sins; and in Him is no sin." ib. 3, 8. With this compare Gen. 3, 15 which, as the *first* promise, is of great significance here, as is also the temptation, the first work of his ministry. From these passages, and in fact from every one bearing on the question, it is evident that the Scriptures speak of Christ the God-man in reference to humanity only in so far as the latter is an object of His *redeeming* love and work.

In full accord with this His relation to man do they place Him into relation to God, whenever they speak of Him as God incarnate. "For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus; who gave Himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time." 1 Tim. 2, 5-6. "And all things are of God, who hath reconciled us unto Himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them. . . . For He hath made Him to be sin for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." 2 Cor. 5, 18-21. 1 Cor. 1, 30-31. "And if any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous," 1 John 2, 1, who "ever liveth making intercession for us." Heb. 7, 25.

Thus, look on whatever page of the Bible we may, and our salvation before God is declared the objective point of the incarnation of His only begotten Son. Abiding by this doctrine, we stand on the sure foundation of the divine Word; going beyond this and looking for other explanations, we enter the quicksand of human philosophy. It is true that in the man Christ Jesus our human nature is found in absolute perfection; and that the Scriptures point

us to Him in that state of being. They do so, however, invariably with a view to our sins and to Jesus as the Savior from sin. They tell us that He is the Lamb of God, without spot and without blemish; but they tell us in the same line that such He is in order to take away the sins of the world, and by His blood to redeem us. John 1, 29 and 1 Pet. 1, 19. "Full of grace and truth" is He; "for it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell;" but this, so that we might take from His fulness grace for grace. John 1, 16 and Col. 1, 19 and context. He is *κατ' εξουσίαν* the Father's beloved Son, in whom He is well pleased; but the same voice from heaven adds: "hear ye Him!" Matt. 17, 5.

The many endeavors made thus far to verify the devices of reason respecting the divine incarnation, present anything but a unity of view and of argument on the side of those engaged in the speculation. And inasmuch as unity involves the prosaic elements of stability and sameness, such a thing can hardly be expected to prevail among men whose dominant passion would seem to be: something fresh and new, only something fresh and new, if not in matter then in phrase. To be sure, in the bare negation, that the salvation of a sinful world cannot alone account for the appearance of God in the flesh, they all agree; though they disagree again as to the *how* and *how much* sin may have had to do with it. It is conceded by the advocates of the "new theology" themselves that, both among the earlier and later promulgators of the opinion under discussion, there were on the one hand those who were led to it on purely pantheistic grounds; and on the other hand those who laid hold of the notion in consequence or in support of gross pelagianism. The latter, denying the necessity of a divine-human sacrifice to atone for sin, and with it the necessity of a God-man to render

such a sacrifice, were forced to find some other reason than the one assigned by the Scriptures for the incarnation of God; and so, as a matter of course, they bade welcome any plausible theory that might account for a fact which they also meant to hold fast. The former, who by their principle of a substantial immanence of the Deity in and of its fusion with all created things identified the divine and the human, God and man, claimed that the consciousness of this identity reposes germinally in all rational creatures; then, that in the person of the God-man this consciousness is both for the first time fully developed, and developed for the purpose of inciting and promoting the same development in the mass of humanity generally. The God-man is man complete; and by Him are all men designed to be men complete, that is, every man a God-man. In justice, at least to the smaller and better class of the "new theology" men, it must be observed that by their own profession they wish to have nothing to do with views so entirely unscriptural, and subversive of pure Christianity. Whether these protestations—sometimes uttered with more noise than good faith would seem to require—really mean all that they say, remains to be seen.

Alongside of the above, and dating back almost as far, other and less offensive reasons were given for the incarnation. One idea advanced was that an absolute harmony of the universe essentially involves and therefore demands the person of the God-man; more particularly, that the incarnation of the Son of God was necessary to a full and perfect realization of the prototype of humanity as such, that is, irrespective of its present fallen condition. Another opinion that gained ground was, that the incarnation could be nothing accidental, and hence, not rest on anything accidental,

such as the fall of man. To have sin account for God's own manifestation in the flesh would, it was thought, rob the great mystery of its true glory; that its real object is to be looked for neither in man nor in any condition of man, but in the God-man Himself and in His relation to God. Whether the incarnation was here conceived to be the product either of some necessitating principle in the divine essence or of some free act of the divine will, is not made clear; only this, that the Divine Self is the object and the ground of the divine incarnation. A third view, building, as it would seem, on the one first noted, and which may be designated as the mystic view, took for its basis the union of the Deity with humanity and of humanity with the Diety, and then maintained or endeavored to maintain that the union could not be effected, even aside from the obstacle of sin, except by a divine-human medium, that is, the God-man. Since in the time before the fall of man the *λόγος* was still *ἀσαρκος*, the actual union and fellowship between God and man, the image of God, is here denied. Accordingly, and certainly in full consistency with the second member of the syllogism adopted, it was by some of the school openly stated that the capacity on the part of man for such a union with God was merely potential, and that man could never have arrived at a union and fellowship with God, even had he remained in his created condition, except by a divine human mediator, such as is the *λόγος ἐνσαρχος*. They did not hesitate to assert that, without the latter, man's capacity for fellowship with his Creator would have proven an entirely useless gift or quality. Still another way by which reason, with a little assistance from Scripture, has arrived at the God-man, may be given as follows: God is love; it is in the very nature of His love to descend and impart itself to man; hence the tendency to become incarnate lies in the

very nature of God; and in the person of the God-man this tendency has worked itself out to its own satisfaction. And thus again, sin or no sin, righteousness or no righteousness, the God-man is, and is accounted for. Beautifully accounted for, but with a beauty somewhat regardless of the truth; for it will be observed that, wholly aside from some other doubtful features in the reasoning, it proceeds on the assumption that God cannot love and bless man, even sinless man, as He would, except by way of His own incarnation. It appears to us only another form or a modern particularization of the first theory noted, when, last of all, humanity in its aspect of an organic entity is employed to explain the fact of the God-man and His appearance among men. A body must have a head, a kingdom its king, and a family its parental lord. Humanity, whether considered as it was by creation or as it is by redemption, is, and is by the very terms of Scripture divinely ordained to be, all this in one: a body, a kingdom and a family. It is then farther premised that the head of this body, etc., must necessarily partake of the nature of this body, that is, of our flesh and blood; and therefore, since God alone can properly be the head of the body, He must become incarnate in order to it. In plain words this means, that God cannot or will not be the head of mankind except as in part one with them in kind. When in this connection 1 Cor. 15, 27 is brought forward as a sort of Scriptural support for this opinion, it may be asked: subject to whom were all things before the incarnation of the Son? and then what does it mean when in verse 24 it is stated that, the end having come, "the Son shall deliver up the kingdom to God, even the Father?" However, more of this anon.

More in order to complete the list than to impugn any one in our time of considering it with favor, place is here

given to the singular whims of *Andrew Osiander* on this subject. He taught that the image of God is in reality the substance or essence of the Word made Flesh; that the visible Christ is the image or copy (*Abbild*) of the invisible God, and that in this image man was created. The Son of God of necessity became incarnate, wholly apart from the consideration of sin; if not, then were Christ the image of Adam, and Adam not the image of Christ or of God. This according to *L. Pelt in Herzog Enc.* Vol. 10, p. 723, O. Ed.

It is from the latter class of old-time theories we have mentioned in outline, that modern theology draws much of its material—and, it may be, its inspiration also—in order to reconstruct and to complete the Christology of the Church. As evident from a more careful notice, the theories now revived all in one way or another place the cause of the divine incarnation either in the Deity or in humanity or in both. Supposing, without in the least admitting, that the Scriptures are silent on the particular point in question, may these theories not be suffered to pass as harmless? and is it true that they offer us nothing more than the correct results of a pure Christian theosophy or mysticism, if not of dogmatic theology? The double source of this doctrine, pantheism and pelagianism, certainly puts it under suspicion; and whether its modern advocates have purified it, as they say they have, of the unclean elements which hang to it by reason of its unholy parentage, is more than doubtful.

To fix or to assume a necessity for the divine incarnation in the essence of the Deity or of humanity or of both, thence in some way or other to define the God-man, as some continue to do, is generally acknowledged to be pantheism; and it is, however much it may be refined and whatever attempts may be made to hide it. The “*Modern glæsus*”

bige Theologie" upon the whole seeks to avoid this disreputable principle, and would substitute for the logical or physical necessity of the pantheist what is termed the ethical necessity; that is, it would account for the fact of the God-man on some necessitating principle lying, not in the divine essence, but in the divine will. Whether this can be done, as long as the principle of absolute necessity is adhered to, without falling back into pantheistic assumptions and deductions, is a question in dispute, and one that will in all likelihood be decided in the negative.

If God is so constituted that He is by some ethical law within Him necessitated to partake of our own nature, the ultimate ground for that law must surely be looked for in the divine substance, or, in other words, be physical in its nature. How, in reasoning on such premises, the borders of pantheism are entered, unavoidably entered as it appears, can be seen from the example of those who make use of the Scriptural declaration that "God is love." The conclusion that God must become *incarnate*, because He is love and love is constrained from within to impart itself, is certainly legitimate only then when love is placed in the essence rather than in the will of God, or when the divine quality is completely identified with the divine substance. However this may be, it is certain that the advocates of this incarnation theory, on whatever grounds and by whichever principles they may proceed, do not preserve intact the Christology taught by the Scriptures and adhered to by the great body of the Church throughout all ages. The fact is that few, indeed very few, among them hold fast to the true doctrine of the atonement. This, the most vital and comforting of all doctrines, is by some entirely abandoned, and by others so weakened as to leave little more than the name of it.

It is taught throughout all Scripture that in the design of God man is intended for communion with God, so that God may be glorified in His creatures and these may be blest in their God. This being the one end of his existence it must be at the same time, and is, the one end also, both of his creation and of his redemption. Comp. e. g. Eph. 1, 1-14; Col. cap. 1; etc. The eternal divine decree to create man, and to restore fallen man for such communion, is the decree of the triune God; and it is an act wholly and solely of His free will. The decree of creation was executed through the *λόγος ἀστρος*; that of redemption through the *λόγος ἔνστρος*. These are the incontrovertible facts as they are set forth in the Scriptures and in every true theological system. Here now the double question is interposed, to-wit: could man have realized the end of his existence without the incarnation of the Logos? and would the Logos have become incarnate had man not failed to realize that end? Now unless those who affirm the latter half of the question mean to reduce the incarnation to a mere arbitrary and purposeless act, they are driven to deny the question in its first half. For, if man in his created condition could have attained to and fully established himself in communion with God under the operation of the Word by whom he was made, and thus could have reached the end of his creation, then why the incarnation? And if man, created in the image of God, could not so have done, then whose is the responsibility for his failure to do what he could not do? But again: if man in his first estate was so constituted that he could hold communion with God, then did he stand in actual communion with Him also; if not, then, as has been pointedly remarked by others, was man a sinner and an object of wrath before the historic fall, inasmuch as he did not employ his powers and use his opportunities. Thus we

would have man fallen before the fall. In this direction then it will be hard to find a reason for the divine incarnation without corrupting the word of God in its teachings on the original condition of man, unless the ground for it be placed in God ; and whither that leads, has been shown.

In a plight not a whit more enviable do we find them when, to shift the argument, they declare that the body organic of mankind demands some one who is above them and yet of them, in order to hold them together and to govern them. Here the determination of God to send His Son into the world, is made a part of His decree of the creation. This implies the two assumptions : the one, that mankind by reason of their creation and God's providence alone—even had sin not come upon them—could never have grown into an organic whole ; that they would have become estranged, divided, in short, sinned with respect to each other. Such, according to this view, was man created in the image of God and subject to His parental care ; surely anything but a perfect creature. The other assumption is, as already indicated a few pages back, that God can not in full satisfaction to Himself and to His creatures govern and bless them, unless He partakes of their nature. To say the least, this is a most venturesome assertion, if not an irreverent one. In this connection some questions suggest themselves. The one is : if the fact of the God-man is to be accounted for on the divine plan of creation, why is He not historically the first of creatures ; or, why did not creation set in with Him ? Another question is : why, to reason by analogy, is there no similar need for God to partake of the nature of angels, or of the creature world generally ? The third question is : if God could, as He certainly did,

•

through the *λόγος ἀστρος* *create* man, why should He not be able just as well and through the same medium, to govern man? Or, the same question on purely ethical grounds, since God was pleased so to create man why should He not be pleased so to govern him also?

The hurtful character of this theory and its most objectionable features, however, are brought to the surface when this hypothetical Christ is brought face to face with the real Christ, the Christ of the Bible and of history, and with what He was to men and did for them. The Scriptures declare that the Son of God was manifested to the end that "He might destroy the works of the devil," and "to take away our sins." This saving work of the Christ of God and the Savior of men, the true Christian theology of the past sums up in the threefold office of Christ the Prophet, Priest and King—all terms given by the inspired Word itself. What effect now has the teleology proposed by the "*New Theology*" on this clear and satisfactory doctrine of the divine Word and the Church? To be sure, we are told and told again that no annulment of Scripture declarations is intended, but simply some supplementary or amendatory features, which the Scriptures themselves would seem to justify if not call for. Innocent assurances, these; but upon a careful examination of the new things proposed, one is reminded of Herod's words to the wise men from the east: "Go, and search diligently for the young child; and when ye have found him, bring me word again, that I may come and worship Him also."

The amendment brought forward to change "in somewhat" the words of St. John and the plainer teachings of the Gospel generally, would read about as follows: Christ indeed did destroy the works of the devil and take away

our sins in a certain way; but for this purpose was the Son of God not manifested; at least, this was not the true, the first and chief purpose of His manifestation; sin only placed itself in His way, and on His way toward the accomplishment of His true mission; the doing away of sin was in no essential and objective sense the cause of His coming, for come into the flesh he would have anyway; sin only gave a somewhat different shape to His life from what this would have assumed had sin not thrust itself in His way. Sin or no sin, God was to become man and—this much in deference to the Scriptures and the faith of the Church—thus become the Prophet, Priest and King of mankind in either event. “And this, moreover, is not a beautiful dream merely”—says *Ebrard, Herzog Enc.* VI., p. 613, O. Ed.—“for Christ was in reality, wholly apart from His redeeming work, already according to His essence the Prophet, Priest and King in the purely ethical sense described.”*

It is clear that, according to this tenet of the “*New Theology*,” the despoliation of Satan and the salvation of sinners to the glory of God do not constitute *the* object but at best *an* object of the incarnation of the Son of God. Not divine *mercy* but some necessitating or constraining principle in the essence or in some attribute of God has planned and executed this, the most profound and adorable of God’s mysteries. The significant order of the old dogmaticians and of the people’s catechisms: Christ our Prophet, Priest

* *E.*’s argument is, that humanity without sin would have offered itself to God as a living personal sacrifice; and that this its priestly work would have reached its climax in Christ its high-priestly Head who, as the absolute child of God, would have placed into the service of God the very *pleroma* of all human energies.—Query: Would sinless man individually and collectively not have done this same thing, especially when, as *E.* himself concedes, mankind, sin not entering, would have constituted itself as an organic whole? And if so, then why the incarnation of the Son to place into the service of God, what the body human could and would have done the very *pleroma* of all human energies?

and King, is made to read: Christ our Prophet, King—and Priest, and is thus subverted and fatally injured. More acceptable perhaps, if the “*New Theology*” had but the honest boldness to confess it, would be the *triad*: Christ the ideal man, the man in whom the genus is for the first time made complete and perfect; the sovereign man, the man who binds together, represents and rules the species; and lastly, the beneficent man, the man who, in some way not yet definitely ascertained, leads his worshipers on to perfection and happiness.

It is to be feared—and its doctrine on the atonement will show the grounds for it—that the sainted *Philippi* is right when he says: “The doctrine, that the incarnation of the Son of God was necessary, even apart from sin, in order that thus the idea of humanity (*Menschheitsidee*) not completed in creation might be perfectly realized, is nothing else than a speculative counterfeit (literally, *speculative Wechselbalg* = sp. changeling) substituted for the biblical and churchly doctrine which teaches that the incarnation of the Son of God was necessary for the purpose of a vicarious satisfaction to be rendered for the guilt of sin which by the fall from his original perfection man, who was not only adopted for but created in the image of God, introduced into the world.” *Glaubenslehre*, Vol. I., p. 23, 3. Ed. On the same page *Philippi* furthermore remarks: “Thus however is the doctrine concerning sin and the atonement removed from the centre to the periphery, and reduced to the place of a subordinate and secondary moment in the doctrine of salvation; the most profound import of the Christian consciousness, the vital consciousness of the necessity of atonement for the guilt of sin through the death of the God-man, and of this atonement actually rendered by Him—does not only find inadequate expression, but is fatally injured.”

"Insignificant—says *F. J. Winter* in his edition of the present third edition of "*Christi Person und Werk*," by *Thomasius*, p. 180—as the question before us may appear in its immediate practical bearings, however much mere abstract possibilities may enter into its discussion and this may therefore seem to run into a mere play of thought, yet does its importance lie in the decision whether, on its ultimate grounds, the incarnation of the Son of God is to be understood either as the mere product in which the creative idea has worked itself out, or as an act of mercy wholly free. The former view derives the incarnation from a relation of God and humanity existing *per se*; and as in so doing it is obviously infected with a touch of pantheism, so it ascribes to entering sin the effect only that through it the kind and manner of the incarnation was determined, as also the surrender of the Son of God to suffering and death. The latter view, on the other hand, declares the entrance of sin to be such a fearful rupture, and such a decided breach between the world and God, that by it the counsel or decree of God was not only modified but constrained to resort to entirely new ways. 'Tis sin that 'hath drawn forth from Love divine its most glorious revelation, that revelation which passeth far beyond every hope and prayer and thought of humanity.' And this view of the matter is confirmed both by the unanimous testimony of the Scriptures (p. 134) and by the immediate Christian consciousness, 'the doxology of pardoned and favored sinners, which, sung throughout the generations of the Church, praises the superhuman majesty of the love of a merciful God in this that, outdoing human sin through the riches of His grace, He hath given and given for us His Son moved by mercy wholly free, and by this alone.' (*Frank.*) Over against *Dorner* this holds true,

that the end of the ways of God is not the God-man but the man of God; and whether to this end the incarnation of God were indispensable, even had man not sinned, in order through it to lay the foundation for that measure of self-communication which man requires—that is a question which cannot be affirmed. ‘From the ethical idea of God as love and of man as susceptible of God, as also from absolute religion as the religion of the union of the two (God and man), only the communion of God and humanity can be followed, and in consequence of it the possibility but not the (absolute) necessity of the God-man.’ (*Luthardt*).’

We hold fast the great mystery of Godliness, God is manifest in the flesh; and that this is *the* miracle of God’s own free mercy. The final object of His coming among us with reference to ourselves we believe to be our salvation from sin. The Word was made flesh, and hence He is the Son of man; but He is the Son of man in order to be the Savior of man. Already many centuries ago it was declared that *peccato non existente, incarnatio non fuisset*; no sin, no God-man; and no one need hesitate to make this aphorism his own. It does not follow, as *Ebrard, Liebner* and others would have it, that then sin is more a good than an evil. Such logic, in vogue already in the days of St. Paul and by him rejected, Rom. 6, 1, it is no honor to revive, whatever the “New Theology” may think and say to the contrary.

With regard to the objection raised by the followers of *Duns Scotus* that, unless their view be the correct one, the most perfect revelation of God, Christ Himself, would be something purely accidental, a *bonum occasionatum*,* *Thoma-*

“There is also a difficulty in believing that but for this insignificant earth the most glorious revelation of God might not have been given at all. The principal defect, however, is that Christ is made contingent on sin, and that sin, therefore, appears to be not only more fundamental than Christ, but an absolute necessity, in

sius says: "This (*objection*) rests on the antithesis which exists between the accidental and arbitrary on the one hand and the necessary on the other; but this antithesis admits of no application here. For even the most free act of love, because it lacks an inner necessity for God, is on that account by no means something accidental or a thing of chance. If so, then were it a chance thing that God lovingly reveals Himself in general; the essence of love, however, is liberty; where this is denied, love itself is destroyed. The proposition therefore stands, that redemption—in its wider sense—is the object of the incarnation of the Son of God." p. 139.

"Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, He also Himself likewise took part of the same; that through death He might destroy him that had the power of death, that is, the devil; And deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their life-time subject to bondage. For verily He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren; that He might be a merciful and faithful High

order that God might reveal Himself in Christ. The old sub- and supra-lapsarian theories are waymarks of the struggle of profound minds with this great difficulty. . . . 'This planet,' says Doener 'may be the Bethlehem of the universe.' But if this planet and the sin of man exhaust the meaning of Christ's mediation, we are left among absurdities and confusions. Bethlehem itself could not be a sacred name if there were no Jerusalem nor Samaria, nor uttermost parts of the earth, to which from Bethlehem He goes out, whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting." *And. Review*, July 1885, p. 56, 57. But to this we answer: If from the incarnation of Christ on account of this earth and sin it follows that these are "more fundamental than Christ," so would it follow that "the universe" however big this may be and of however many "worlds" it may be made up, would be "more fundamental than Christ;" i. e. the creation greater and of more importance than the Christ of God. Again: thus far the Church has known as but one Bethlehem so also but one Jerusalem, that is, one birth-place of Christ and one Golgatha where he offered Himself once for all—and she has escaped all the "absurdities and confusions" which, according to "Andover," are consequent upon such a position. We therefore conclude that these are evils wholly imaginary, conjured up by minds that spin out astronomical fancies into theological theories, and thus remove difficulties with which the profound minds of the past have struggled in vain.

Priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people. For in that He Himself hath suffered, being tempted, He is able to succour them that are tempted. Heb. 2, 14-18. This is indeed the Christ, the Savior of the world.

C. H. L. S.

CHURCH AUTHORITY.

In virtue of their union with Christ by faith Christians are freed from the slavery to which sin has reduced mankind. According to our Lord's assurance, the truth has made them free. They are Christ's, and owe allegiance to no other Lord and King. The recognition of any other master and the submission to any other authority is disloyal to the one and only Lord in heaven and earth. He reigns alone, and will divide His power and His honor with no creature. God hath "raised Him from the dead and set Him at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality and power and might and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but in that which is to come, and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him to be head over all things to the Church." Eph. 1, 20-22.

Usually Christ's kingdom is described as threefold, namely, the kingdom of power, the kingdom of grace, and the kingdom of glory. In the first, which extends over all the nations, He reigns with might, reducing all to subjection by His almighty power. Whether they will hear the Lord's word with awe or despise it with levity, they must submit to His authority at last. If they will not be drawn by His love they will be driven by His power. In the sec-

ond He reigns with mercy, calling men to the pardon and peace which He has purchased for all, and giving them the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry, Abba, Father. Here His grace works effectually in them that believe, and renders them willing and joyful subjects of the Savior King, who makes all things work together for their good on earth and their glory in heaven. In the third, which extends over the angels and the glorified saints, He reigns in recognized majesty, His subjects all sharing His glory and thus reigning with Him in everlasting blessedness. There no law is needed, because all hearts are in full accord with the King's will, and all delight to His pleasure as they delight to share His bliss. In the first He rules by law, in the second by the Gospel, in the third by His image impressed upon the hearts of angels and spirits of the just made perfect. In all He is Absolute Monarch.

This distinction is important for the right apprehension of the modes in which He exercises His dominion, but must not be interpreted as limiting His royalty in any degree or in any domain. The Lord is God in the kingdoms of the world as well as of the kingdom which is not of this world, and Christians can just as little recognize any other authority in the State as in the Church. But He does not reign in the same way in both. The reason why Christians are subject to "the powers that be," to whom the sword is committed, is the same as that for which they are subject to those who have the rule over them in the Church, to whom the Word is committed. In both cases they are subject for the Lord's sake and for conscience' sake. It is the Lord's authority that is recognized. "Let every soul be subject to the higher power. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whoever therefore

resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God." "Therefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For this cause pay ye tribute also; for they are God's ministers, attending continually upon this very thing." Rom. 13, 1-6. The king or the governor rules over us not in virtue of any inherent superiority to which he could lay claim as a man. In that regard he is the equal of his subjects, and no one owes him obedience. We are subject to him only because He to whom we are all subject has so ordered and ordained. In like manner those who preach the Gospel are ministers of God and responsible to Him. "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God. However, it is required in stewards that a man be found faithful." 1 Cor. 4, 1. 2. "Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls, as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you." Heb. 13, 17. In both cases the authority to which submission is required is that of God, not that of man, and the Christian, conscious of his deliverance from every human yoke of bondage, is subject only for the Lord's sake, and therefore only so far as his loyalty to the one Lord and King of all implies and permits.

But there is a manifest difference in the mode of exercising divine authority and therefore in determining the rights and duties of ministers and subjects in the two domains. In the civil government the Lord has not laid down the special policy to be pursued and the laws by which the conduct of the people is to be regulated. Instead of giving a constitution and laws He has given the rulers power to make them and authority to enforce them, and has imposed upon citizens the duty to obey. We must therefore needs

be subject to the former, as ordained of God, and the laws enacted by them, so far as they impose nothing which God has forbidden. The rulers are not required to show from the Scriptures that their ordinances are merely the enforcement of laws recorded there. The Bible is not a book of civil statutes. The civil government makes the laws, and the citizen is bound to obey the laws thus made, provided only that they do not tread upon a sphere in which the State has no authority and do not thus require what the Lord has prohibited and what therefore cannot with a good conscience be rendered. The whole field of reason and right, of prudence and policy, are thus open to the officers of the State for wise legislation, and what they decree is binding upon their subjects, not because the contents of these decrees are themselves of moral obligation and effect their conscience, but because the lawgivers are clothed with authority as ministers of God, to frame them and require obedience, and with power to compel such obedience when it is not rendered willingly.

But in the Church it is not so. The ministers are not lawmakers, nor is the whole republic of Christians authorized to bind anything upon the conscience of any brother. There the King rules exclusively by His Word. He has conformed no one to institute articles of faith or to make laws for Christians. The pope only shows himself to be the Antichrist when he arrogates to himself this divine prerogative, and any other man or body of men would be guilty of an anti-Christian usurpation if they imitated the pope's arrogance and sought to bind consciences where the Lord has left them free. What He requires us to believe and to do, that He has Himself declared; and we are not only not bound to submit to any additional doctrines or laws in the

domain of conscience, but we are bound to resist any attempts to impose them and to denounce the imposition as rebellious against the rightful King in Zion and subversive of truth and righteousness. Our Lord declares: "In vain they do worship Me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Matt. 15, 9. And St. Paul admonishes: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." Gal. 5, 1. The submission to human ordinances in the Church, which deals with the heart and with spiritual things, not, like the civil government, with the external conduct and temporal affairs, is the enslavement of the soul, which Christ has redeemed and sanctified for Himself that He might rule in it alone.

While God has left it to the reason and wisdom of men to frame the necessary laws for the State, He has Himself in His Word laid down all that is necessary for the guidance of the conscience and the government of the soul. The Holy Scriptures are sufficient for this. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16. 17. And because they contain all that is needed, so that God's people are thus thoroughly furnished for their guidance, nothing else, though it pretend to come from God, can, without sinning against the majesty of the Lord, be accepted as obligatory. "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." Gal. 1, 8. Hence making any addition to this Word is strictly forbidden. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye

diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you." Deut. 4, 2. "I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and from the things which are written in this book." Rev. 22, 18. 19. There is but one Lord, and the soul necessarily falls into idolatry when it recognizes the claim of any other to rule over it, as he who puts forth such a claim is necessarily a usurper of divine authority.

Accordingly our Lord does not command subjection to authorities in the Church as He does to the "powers that be" in the State. He has appointed no such authorities, and therefore there are none. Those who pretend to be lords in this domain can only be usurpers. Jesus said to His disciples, "Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you." Matt. 20, 25. 26. No such power is given to one over another in the kingdom which is not of this world, when the question is not one of external obedience, but of internal submission of the whole soul to the one and only King, the acknowledgment of whose supremacy is a fundamental condition of citizenship in His kingdom. "Then said Jesus to the Jews which believed on Him, if ye continue in my Word, then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John 8, 31. 32. In that liberty they are all equal among themselves; while they are all equally subject to the one Lord, whose word is

absolutely and exclusively authoritative, as the declaration of the Monarch's will. Hence He says: "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren." Matt. 23, 8. Even those who are called to preach and apply His Word, and in this sense have "the rule over" those who are taught and governed by it, are directed to regard themselves as ministers and servants, not as masters and lords. "Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lords over God's heritage, but being examples to the flock." 1 Pet. 5, 2. 3. "For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and ourselves your servants for Jesus' sake." 2 Cor. 4, 5. Repeatedly and in various forms the truth is inculcated that the Lord is God alone, and that He will permit no creature to share His authority; and in accordance with this the warnings and admonitions are numerous, that no creature should presume to usurp His throne and exercise His authority, and that no disciple should recognize the usurper, if any one should wantonly seek to lord it over God's heritage. "Ye are bought with a price, be not ye the servants of man. 1 Cor. 7, 23.

It was one of the great blessings of the Reformation that it brought again to the knowledge of the Church this liberty of the children of God from all human yokes and this equality of the brotherhood in things spiritual. Not that those who appeal to Luther and his work in justification of their latitudinarianism and licentiousness have any ground for their proceeding. They evidently misapprehend the whole matter. Nothing was further from the thoughts of this great Reformer than the godless opinion that man is an independent being, who is subject to no law but that of

his own individual reason or arbitrary will. In Luther's mind the truth that God reigns was the foundation of all thinking and working, and any private judgment that failed to recognize His authority or refused to submit to His Word was atheistic and devilish. And so it is. When man presumes to be his own lord and master, he rejects God and renounces the sovereign Lord of all. There is then no ground left for true religion or true morality, and it becomes a matter of indifference, so far as all the moral interests of the soul are concerned, what doctrines he may teach or what life he may lead. All is lost in any case, and nothing can be done to remedy the evil but to abandon the ungodly principle by which all thinking and willing are vitiated. What Luther taught, in accordance with the Word of God, and the Lutheran Church still teaches and in order to be a faithful witness of the Word, must teach, is the sovereignty of Christ and the supremacy of His Word; and hence the freedom of all God's people from every known yoke, because of their subjection to the one Lord, and the equality of all subjects of the great King, because all are equally and absolutely subject to that one Lord. Prating about liberty, with the assumption that every man may believe and do what he pleases and be a slave of the devil in any form that suits his taste, is as absurd as it is ungodly. Absolute submission to the Lord of all is the only possible way to be free, and all who are thus free are brethren, over whom only one is Master, even Christ.

As these brethren are all, so far as spiritual things are concerned, the equals of each other, so no one in Christ's kingdom can lord it over another and authoritatively dictate to another what he must believe or what he must do to please God. No man can bind his creed or force his convictions of right upon another. No doctrine must be believed

and no law must be observed on the ground that any man so wills and commands. The Word of God alone has authority over the conscience. If one knows the saving truth which God has revealed in Holy Scripture for our faith, he should confess and teach that truth, because it is saving truth for all men alike; if he knows what the Lord has commanded in His Word, he should show the will of the Lord to others, because it is divine law which all men are bound to obey. But it is not obligatory because he teaches it, and does not become obligatory because a thousand or a million of human beings teach it. It is obligatory because the Lord teaches it, and the approval of millions of men cannot add to its divine authority and obligation, as its rejection by millions cannot detach from its divine obligation. One may entreat another to accept it and obey it, because it is the voice and will of Him who is Lord of all, but he cannot by his authority bind it upon the conscience of another who refuses to recognize the authority of God; and he who, while he refuses to accept the authority of Holy Scripture or fails to find in Holy Scripture the doctrine or law in question, accepts it merely upon the authority of men who urge it, is so far not a true subject of the King, but a servile follower of men. We can teach the Word, and in accordance with it extort and warn and rebuke, but we have no independent authority to dictate creeds and issue laws. The Lord alone has authority in heaven and earth, and the exercise of that authority among men is exclusively by His Word. "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Is. 8, 20. "He that is of God heareth God's words; ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God." John 8, 47. The acknowledg-

ment of God's Word as supreme is the prime characteristic of His people. They speak with the psalmist: "My heart standeth in awe of Thy Word." Ps. 119, 161. As long as that is recognized, there is hope for the soul, because the entrance of that Word giveth light. But when men turn away from that, and assign authority to man's thoughts and wishes, some exercising lordship and some allowing themselves to be reduced to bondage, all avenues are opened for the nefarious work of the father of lies.

As one individual cannot rule over the conscience of another, so a number of individuals joined together cannot rule over the consciences of other individuals. The Church, which is the congregation of believers, has no more power and authority than the individual believer. It has the Word, by which He who is her Head, and to whom all power is given in heaven and earth, governs His kingdom, and beyond this she has no power and needs none. Those who are outside of that kingdom she does not profess to rule and cannot rule; those who are in it recognize the King and reverence His Word, but call no man Master.

The disciples of Christ, who by faith are members of the one Holy Christian Church, which is the communion of saints, are required, whenever this becomes possible, to form local congregations or churches, and for the organization and government of such congregations the Lord has made regulations to which His people are bound and which they accept because they are under Him in His kingdom. Whether believers shall confess Christ or not; whether they shall unite or not with others who make the same confession; whether they shall preach the Word and administer the sacraments, and thus edify the body of Christ and extend His kingdom, or not do this; whether or not they shall to this end call a

minister, and thus form a flock over which he is set as pastor; whether or not, in other words, the members of the invisible church shall form visible congregations whenever it is possible,—this is not a matter which is left to the discretion of believers. The King has issued His mandates in this regard and given them to His people in the Holy Scriptures. He has declared: “The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith which we preach, that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.” Rom. 10, 8-10. He has given us the warning: “Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him shall the Son of man be ashamed when He shall come in His own glory and in His Father’s and of the holy angels.” Luke 9, 26. He has moved His apostle to write: “I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you, but that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.” 1 Cor. 1, 10. He enjoins them to “keep the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all and through all and in you all.” Eph. 4, 3-6. Therefore He has directed the same apostle to write: “I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.” Rom. 16, 17. He has ordered it to be written: “The God of patience and consolation grant you to be like-

minded one toward another according to Christ Jesus, that ye may with one mind and one mouth glorify God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Wherefore receive ye one another, as Christ also received us to the glory of God." Rom. 15, 5-7. He has commanded: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." Matt. 28, 19. 20. He has ordained that to this end, as the nature of the case requires, there shall be teachers and pastors, as it is written: "Let a man so account of us as of the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God;" and again: "No man taketh this honor unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." 1 Cor. 4, 1; Heb. 5, 4. Hence He has commanded that due honor should be given to ministers as His ambassadors, whom He has sent to speak His Word in His name: "Obey them that have the rule over you and submit yourselves; for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, that they may do it with joy, and not with grief; for that is unprofitable for you." Heb. 13, 17. It is written accordingly that those who believed the Word and were baptized "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayer," and that churches were found in different places, so that the apostle could write "unto the church of God which is at Corinth," "unto the churches which are in Galatia," etc. Acts 2, 42; 1 Cor. 1, 2; Gal. 1, 2. It is commanded that a brother who errs should be admonished by his brethren to put away his sin, "and if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen

man and a publican." Matt. 18, 17. It is required that bishops or pastors should watch over the churches committed to their charge: "Take heed therefore unto yourselves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the church of God which He hath purchased with His own blood." Acts 20, 28. "The elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an elder and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and also a partaker of the glory which shall be revealed, feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind." 1 Pet. 5, 1. 2. It is commanded that when Christians have thus joined together for the administration of the means of grace and public worship, the brethren should not stand aloof or absent themselves from the assembly of the saints: "Let us hold fast the profession of our faith without wavering; for He is faithful that promised; and let us consider one another to provoke unto love and good works, not forsaking the assembling of ourselves together, as the manner of some is, but exhorting one another, and so much the more as ye see the day approaching." Heb. 10, 23-25. Manifestly the will of the Lord cannot be done without forming congregations in which His name is confessed and His means of grace administered. That the King has clearly ordained.

But it is true, also, that when these mandates of the Lord are executed in the organization of visible churches some regulations will be made that are not of divine obligation. There are things which human judgment sees to be expedient for the attainment of the divinely appointed end, and which must be managed by mutual agreement in the exercise of the church's wisdom and charity. The members

exercise their wisdom in devising the best means and appliances for the accomplishment of the end in view; they exercise their charity in yielding preferences for the sake of order and harmony. God has ordained that a pastor shall be called, but He has not ordained that any given congregation must choose a definite one among the many qualified, so that only he, and no other, would, according to the divine ordinance, be the pastor of that congregation. He has ordained that the pastor shall be appointed, but He has not designated a special amount which the congregation must give for the purpose, or a definite sum or proportion which each member must pay towards it. He has ordained that the Word shall be preached in the public assembly; but He has not ordained what texts shall be chosen, how long the sermons must be, or even in what particular language or what particular place they shall be delivered. He has ordained that the people shall hear the Word and worship the Lord in the assembly of the saints; but He has not ordained at what time and place such public hearing and worship shall be performed, or even how often the congregation shall have such services, or the individual shall attend them. There is much that is free within that which is obligatory, and that which belongs to the former class and is left to human regulation must never be confounded with that which belongs to the latter class and is regulated by divine commandment.

We are prepared now for an intelligent and direct answer to the question concerning ecclesiastical authority. The Church cannot make the articles of faith; God has given them in His Word for man's acceptance. The Church cannot make the law for men's consciences; God has set forth that also in His Word for man's obedience. She is

the Bride of Christ in virtue of her submission to that Word as her only rule and guide; she would lose her distinctive existence and become a very antichrist, as the pope is, if she presumed to usurp the divine prerogative. Neither can she enhance the authority of the Word by her sanction. God is above all, and it is the ridiculousness of arrogance to think of rendering His power more effective by human approval and support. All that the Church can do is to bear humble witness to the truth and the right as the divine Word declares it and as the Holy Spirit has given her power to see it, and to show forth the sincerity and earnestness of her testimony by maintaining the truth and enforcing the right as God gives her ability.

This necessarily implies that, while believers heed the command and obey the impulse to unite with other believers in the administration of the means of grace for their own edification and for the gathering in of others who are yet without hope in the world, they hold to the revealed truth as their bond of union. To bear witness of that and exercise the privilege and enjoy the benefits which that confers, is the very object of their joining together and remaining in fellowship. Without that they might be a human society, or even a religious association, but not a Christian Church, which is an assembly of believers gathered together in Jesus' name and continuing in His Word. Hence it is manifest that, according to the Lord's will they cannot, and according to their allegiance to their Lord they will not, for the purpose of bearing their witness to the truth in Jesus, enter into an organization with those who reject it or substitute human error in its room, and will not remain in fellowship with any man or party who refuse to witness it or who teach opposing doctrines. Accordingly those who "agree con-

cerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments" unite on that basis, and refuse to unite with those who do not agree on this Scriptural ground. All others are excluded, and if they think it right to unite on other grounds and form an opposition Church, they can do so, but must answer for it when the day of reckoning comes. And if any of those who have united as witnesses of the truth should afterwards fall away and reject what they once confessed in unity with others, those others of course, when the defection becomes a settled fact, all efforts to regain the erring having proved futile, refuse to have further fellowship with them. This is the necessary discipline which the Church exercises. She must maintain the truth and the right, even to the extreme of separation or exclusion.

When a number of organizations thus formed join together for mutual help and advancement, and for the prosecution of work which requires larger means and forces than those of a single congregation, it needs scarcely be mentioned that they cannot change their foundation and unite on some other basis. Congregations can no more unite in a synod unless they "agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments," than can individuals in a congregation, and a union of congregations in a synod can no more tolerate error and unrighteousness than a union of individuals in a congregation. Synods too must maintain the revealed Word even to the extreme of excluding congregations from their fellowship, and that for precisely the same reason which requires the congregation to resort to this extremity when all other efforts fail to preserve the unity of the faith. The Word of God receives no new authority by synodical sanction. The Church in this more extended form of a synod or of a whole denomination can

do nothing but preserve its character as a witness of the saving truth. An organization of churches has no power that is not lodged in the individual churches so joined. Nor does it at all change the matter when the fact is taken into account that such a union of churches is not divinely commanded, but is left to the judgment and love of the individual congregations. These are not bound to join a synod for the sake of maintaining their right to exist as churches; but when they do unite, as the work which God has given them to do suggests and ordinarily requires, they can do it only on the basis of the truth which God has given, and can be subject to no other authority than that which they have recognized as the bond of union in the local church. Christians would, stultify themselves if they united in the congregation under the exclusive authority of the one Master, Christ, and then consented, in a larger union, to accept some other or some additional authority. Our grand Augsburg Confession enunciates a solemn truth of far-reaching import when it declares: "Unto the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments." Any organization, whether congregation or synod or denomination, that asks more than this as a condition of fellowship, stamps itself as a sect. Congregations and synods must insist on what the King ordains; they must not usurp the King's authority and presume to make their human regulations binding on the conscience of men who have not voluntarily adopted them.

The doctrine of such liberty we must maintain as a necessary part of the faith which forms the bond of union, and Christians are required to suffer persecutions and divisions rather than allow themselves to be reduced to bondage

under any human yoke. Wherein the Lord has left us free we can have mutual agreements for the sake of expediency and obligate ourselves to certain work, but such regulations impose no obligation upon others. They are assumed in freedom, and can never be bound upon Christians as demands, obedience to which is necessary in the kingdom of God. If the King has not required what they demand, how can Christians insist on it? If the King has not required it, how can loyal subjects of that King presume to declare obedience to it a condition of membership in His kingdom? Its adoption was not part of the original basis of union, which in a church association can be only what is required by the Lord Himself in His Word; and the attempt to foist in such a human ordinance as a condition of continuance among the people of God is a usurpation of divine prerogatives which, because it undermines the kingship of Christ and the supremacy of His Word, Christians cannot tolerate. They will hear the Word of the Lord, and His disciples will insist on what they find required in that Word, whether man will hear or refuse to hear; they will listen to advice and entreaty in matters not settled by that Word, but will not submit to the dictations of men who would lord it over God's heritage. The Church has no authority but that of the Word, of which it is a witness and which it applies.

We are not overlooking the fact that when Christians have united as a visible church, or churches have united in a synod, on the basis which the Lord has prescribed and which is essential, but which is alone essential to the constitution of a church, they may, for the sake of external order and from motives of expediency, make regulations for their own government. But obviously these must then

be treated as matters of human order and expediency, appealing to the wisdom and the charity of brethren with advisory and persuasive power, not as matters of divine revelation coming with the authority of God to the consciences of men and demanding unquestioning submission as mandates of the King. Christians can exercise their Christian liberty in making rules according to which they will conduct their worship and carry on their work, but others have the same liberty also, and it is an absurdity to maintain that because one has exercised his liberty in a certain particular, the other is in that particular no longer free.

There are few thoughts conceived more in the spirit of sect and disintegration, and more mischievous in their realization, than that which has been expressed in justification of a false exclusiveism; to wit, that any denomination or even any local congregation may agree on any terms of association which it may think fit, and that no one has a right to complain of any interference with his liberty, because no one is compelled to join the society, and those who do not like the terms may form other associations on any terms they choose. If what is called Lutheran exclusive-ness is made to rest on any such assumptions as this, we want no hand in it and no share in the responsibility. The thought is radically erroneous. Man cannot make the terms on which the children of God are to unite. That the Head of the Church has done, and other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid. Men may form societies for temporal purposes, and may make any conditions of membership that may suit their purpose. But they must not imagine that such human organizations are churches, and must not presume that the Lord, whose conditions of membership have been wantonly set aside, will adopt Himself to

their whims and give them all the powers and prerogatives of His Church. All societies that claim to do His work without subjecting themselves to His will as revealed in His Word are an abomination in His sight. For the constitution of churches and for the union of churches that is necessary which the Lord Himself, who is Head over all things to the Church, requires and prescribes in His Word, and nothing else is necessary, because the Church knows no other Lord.

Therefore no regulations made in the exercise of Christian liberty can be laid upon men in virtue of any supposed church authority. Whatever can be shown to be a requirement of the Lord must be urged upon His authority, not upon any supposed power that the Church has over and above the Word which is her only rule of faith and practice; whatever cannot thus be shown to be His requirement may be agreed on in Christian freedom, but can bind only those who enter into the agreement and cannot be enforced upon others with menaces of discipline in case of non-compliance. All that congregations or synods can set forth with a "Thus saith the Lord" can be enforced and must be enforced upon His authority, otherwise the members would not be loyal subjects of the great King; what they think good, aside from this, for the accomplishment of their ends and the preservation of order in doing their work, is, so far as those are concerned who have not been consulted or were not originally parties in the agreement, only advisory, and cannot be enforced as a condition of membership, or even of good standing, in the church or synodical association of churches.

It is radically wrong to put human rules or rites of expediency on a level with divine requirements, whether this

be done by urging them as obligatory upon the conscience or by threatening or executing discipline as if they were part of the fundamental law of the Church and thus conditions of membership. They are not divine requirements, but special agreements made in liberty and complied with in liberty. So far as an individual has given his consent, he is expected to observe them; so far as he has given promises, whether expressly or by implication, he must be held, as a matter of right, to keep them. On that the brethren must insist, because honesty is a divine requirement. But the obligation rests wholly on a free assumption of labors or burdens, not on any authority vested in others to lord it over their brethren. When a man agrees to pay 50 dollars towards the support of the pastor for the year, he is bound to pay it, because he has bound himself by his word to pay it; but if a congregation passes the resolution that he must pay that much without such agreement on his part, the resolution has no binding power, and he is just as free to do what seems to him right and good as he was before. A congregation that would seek to enforce such a resolution by discipline and excommunication would make additions to God's Word and become heretical. When a congregation agrees to pay a certain proportion of the expense attending a work undertaken in connection with other congregations, synod can require it to fulfill the obligations assumed, because this the Lord requires; but if synod passes the resolution that it shall pay a certain sum, without asking its consent, such resolution imposes no obligation, because it has not divine authority. In short, that which the Lord requires, and which is the foundation of all church organization and work, is obligatory and must be insisted on even to the extent of exclusion and separation; all the rest is

merely advisory, and any attempt to impose it as obligatory on the conscience and make membership in the church dependent upon it, is heretical and schismatical, because it makes additions to the Word of God.

Here we might end this article. Our purpose was to point out the principles which were at stake in the question concerning church authority, and to lift a voice of warning to the Church, against all doctrines and practices which put the supreme and exclusive authority of our Lord and His Word in the Church, or in any way conflict with the sound words of our Augstana: "To the true unity of the Church it is sufficient to agree concerning the doctrine of the Gospel and the administration of the sacraments. Nor is it necessary that human traditions, rites, or ceremonies instituted by men should be alike everywhere." Art. 7.

But a word more seems necessary in order fully to set forth the divine will in regard to church government. It is supposed by many that if no authority attaches to congregational or synodical resolutions, and that no obligations are imposed by them, it will be impossible to keep order or carry on successfully the work of the Church. It is the old cry with which we are familiar, and which has been raised against the Lutheran Church since the days of the Reformation. And we must admit that the Romish system has some advantages among an ignorant and undevout people, who know little and care little about the Lord's will, and who must be driven like cattle if they are to be moved at all. But that is not the condition in which the Lord's flock is meant to be, and not the condition in which it will be when faithful pastors perform their work. The normal condition is that of an intelligent faith and an active charity to which appeals may be made. Where those effect nothing there is

no foundation for church work, and nothing but sham can be effected until hearts become changed and faith works by love. But where those exist, the divine plan manifests its beauty and power. In proportion as Christians have come to a consciousness of their rich possessions and their royal rights, they will love order and harmony and peace, and will be glad to unite together with brethren in the promotion of the glory of their Lord and the salvation of the souls purchased by His precious blood, and to this according to any plan, as far as this is a matter of human liberty and choice, that meets the judgment of their fellow-laborers in the cause of Christ. But in that same proportion will they decline to have any yoke of human bondage laid upon them, and will therefore refuse obedience to laws imposed by men who would play the tyrant over them instead of teaching them as brethren. Even though they would be willing to do cheerfully what is demanded, if they were fraternally advised and entreated instead of being driven by law, they cannot submit to usurped authority without detriment to the Gospel. Let the matter be presented on the right grounds, without infringing on the liberty which Christians hold dear, and such persons will be zealous and devoted workers —all the more zealous and all the more devoted because they acknowledge no other Master than Christ.

There is no doctrine of Holy Scripture to which it is impossible to raise objections. But the alleged difficulties in the doctrine presented are not formidable. What is to be done, it is asked, when brethren, notwithstanding that the matter is rightly laid before them, not with any claim of legislative authority, but simply with the pleading that assumes no more than advisory power, still refuse to bear their share of the burden and do their share of the work

which the association has legitimately undertaken? What is to be done when men boast of their liberty and on the strength of it give no attention to the results which their brethren have reached by useful deliberation and disregard all resolutions of congregation or synod? Such cases do occur, and they are deplorable in the extreme. But the way to remedy the evil is certainly not to undermine the Lord's authority by claiming divine authority for sinful men. The Head of the Church has Himself provided for such sad cases. He has commanded that men shall not use their liberty as a cloak of maliciousness. He has commanded that all things should be done in charity. He has commanded that all should seek peace and ensue it. He has commanded that all should walk humbly before their God, and not have a fond conceit of themselves. He has commanded that all things should be done decently and in order. Such and similar directions have divine authority, and when persons make it manifest by their uncharitable and disorderly conduct that they are not willing to be subject to the King in Zion or live in peace with their fellow-citizens in His kingdom—that they will not work for the Master, but rather hinder those who are willing to work and glorify His name—that authority prescribes what shall be done. He commands us to withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly. But we must not withdraw the whole Bible doctrine of church government by assuming that what a congregation or synod, in the free exercise of its judgment, agrees upon and resolves, thus becomes divinely obligatory, and that a brother walks disorderly because he will not recognize the obligation and submit to the usurped authority. Such resolutions are engagements freely assumed by those who make them and in their nature can be only

advisory to others, and when thus presented Christian individuals and ministers will always yield their preferences in love for the sake of peace and harmony. L.

CAPITAL AND LABOR.

The command to labor is universal. It is not limited to a class or to individuals. Its objects, therefore, to supply the means for the maintenance of our earthly existence and the proper support of those dependent upon us, as well as to enable us to obey the demands of charity and the general obligations towards our neighbors, apply universally to all without distinction of position, ability or occupation. This principle effaces all theoretical discrimination between employer and employe, and practically holds both alike accountable for a just and conscientious discharge of their duties in their respective spheres. Both are workers who are bound to invest to the best advantage their various resources and manipulate these with that skill which the nature of their resources requires, whether physical or intellectual.

A fair discussion of the relation of capital to labor or, to borrow modern pass-words, the position of the "monopolist" over against the poor "workingman" and vice versa, is obscured by recognizing "favored classes," or harping on improper distribution of wealth. As long as mankind has existed, rich and poor have lived side by side, and the much-coveted gold has been unequally divided. It is ordained thus by God. "Every man also to whom God hath given riches and wealth, and hath given him power to eat thereof,

and to take his portion and to rejoice in his labor; this is the gift of God." Eccl. 5, 19. And Solomon prays to his Maker: "Give me neither poverty nor riches, feed me with food convenient for me, lest I be full and deny Thee and say, Who is the Lord? or lest I be poor and steal, and take the name of my God in vain." Prov. 30, 8. 9. Men are variously endowed with talents, differing in quality and measure. They further are controlled by disposition and habits, modified frequently by training and education, which cause them to invest their incomes in altogether different ways. Necessities, real or imagined, will consume the revenues of one, which, with the saving propensities and more modest aspirations of another, would form the nucleus of an independent fortune.

As long as men do not all think alike, labor alike, live alike, gain and lose alike, so long wealth must flow into channels which have a faculty to absorb and retain it, shunning such with a propensity to divert it to the satisfaction of superfluous or inordinate display or to the catering for the appetite. Moreover we can recognize a wise dispensation and beautiful plan of God in this law, by which men are more firmly bound together in the conviction of common interdependence through the exercise of mutual help whether in the nature of recompense or of charity.

Monopoly and investment of large capital in gigantic enterprises are not synonymous. Great incomes derived from legitimate business pursuits are not necessarily evidence of a selfish purpose to defraud others of smaller means of the just share of the world's wealth. The assumption, that capital and labor are by nature antagonistic, and that the former is subversive of the interests and just requirements of the latter, is radically false. They stand

in the relation of motive and productive power. The former furnishes the means for material, employment of force, machinery, transportation, storage and distribution; the latter by converting the raw material, operating machinery, handling and disposing of the goods to the consumer in turn causes the outlay to return with interest to the original source. The circulation of wealth then is the life blood of the body politic, upon which its material health depends. Stagnation of this motive power necessarily causes a corresponding diseased condition of the productive power, and all evils consequent upon the disturbance of the proper balance between the two agencies.

It may be claimed that an undue accumulation of wealth in the hands of a limited number of individuals or corporations must necessarily react destructively upon the proper balance between capital and labor by withdrawing either directly or indirectly an unjust proportion of money from circulation among those, whose earnings are devoted to the satisfaction of every-day wants and furnish the means for a proper discharge of the duties to those dependent upon the income of the head of the family. We believe, that in general the objection is well founded, and we can see a positive danger to the industrial condition of a state, in which such vast fortunes are concentrated and tied up in a manner which prevents their subsequent distribution and absorbtion by the market of the world. As a rule, however, we are convinced, that the conditions in our country preclude to a great extent such a calamity by the reinvestment of a great portion of this wealth in new enterprises which open up employment to numerous departments of labor, thus creating new channels for distribution.

Yet, although not succumbing to the pessimistic views

of a majority of labor agitators, whose immediate objects do not bear a close ethical scrutiny, we are constrained to admit that, as a rule, the relations of employers to their subordinates are productive of gross injustice and positive injury, and unless corrected both classes must reap the baneful fruits of an evil seed. This leads us to a consideration of the duties of employers as plainly taught by Scripture.

If it is conceded, that the employer is subject to the same law and duties to his neighbor, as the employe; that the latter is not a simple value or machine which is controlled by the absolute will of the owner; that the employer is as much a steward of his greater wealth and broader opportunities, and accountable to a higher authority for a just administration of the same, as the person in his employ is a steward of his talents and skill of hand; that faithfulness is required of both alike in their respective relation: we must conclude that faithful labor must be recompensed by just wages. "The laborer is worthy of his hire," Luke 10, 7, that is, a fair estimate of the value of the labor of the employe, proportioned to the gain derived therefrom, should determine the wages to which such labor is entitled. Whether the labor be skilled or not cannot be regarded as the sole measure for just remuneration, so long as the work performed is the source of profit. It cannot be difficult to establish an equitable adjustment between labor and wages where the principle is recognized, that the faithful discharge of duty on the part of the employe entitles him to a share of the profits in due proportion to his capital invested, that is, skill and time, and to his responsibility, that is, faithful performance of the work and personal interest in, and conscientious care for the property of the employer.

We believe, that the obstinacy with which employers refuse to acknowledge the justice of this principle is one of the chief obstacles to a fair determination of wage scales. Competition is one of the chief reasons alleged for reducing wages of labor to a minimum. Cheap labor insures cheap prices of the goods manufactured and larger profits. But we are more likely to find the true cause for this unchristian "business maxim" in the competitive race for rapid amassing of wealth, which very generally leads to investment of too large capital and an increase of facilities, conditioning an assumption of risk altogether out of proportion to the demands of legitimate consumption and the ability of the investor. As a rule employers seek *their* profits only, are concerned about the percentage of increase on their own investments, whilst they remain forgetful of the material welfare of the hand that coins their gold. "Go to now, ye rich men, weep and howl for your miseries that shall come upon you. Your riches are corrupted and your garments are moth-eaten. Your gold and silver is cankered and the rust of them shall be a witness against you and shall eat your flesh as it were fire. Ye have heaped treasure together for the last days. Behold, the hire of the laborers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of Sabaoth." James 5, 1-4.

With equal severity the Word of God denounces the criminal dilatoriness, by which earned wages is withheld from the employe. "The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee until the morning," Lev. 19, 13. "Thou shalt not oppress an hired servant that is poor and needy, whether he be of thy brethren or of thy strangers that are in thy land within thy gates. At his day thou shalt give.

him his hire, neither shall the sun go down upon it, for he is poor and setteth his heart upon it: lest he cry against thee unto the Lord and it be a sin unto thee." Deut. 24, 14. 15. It is difficult to conceive how a Christian employer can hire men to labor with fidelity and unselfish diligence, claiming the exercise of their skill and physical endurance in his service for stipulated remuneration, and, with the profits of their work filling his coffers, refuse to pay the just debt he owes them, or by delaying wages cause care and suffering to oppress the heart and darken the sky of the home circle. The wrong of delaying the payment of honest debts through negligence and dishonesty, sinks into insignificance beside this injustice perpetrated upon working-men, whose wages signifies their daily bread and the necessities of life for wife and children. Verily, it crieth out against such conscienceless wreckers of lives and homes.

Scarcely less reprehensible is a method adopted by many manufacturers and corporations, to pay their employes in "*scrip*" or orders on stores owned or operated by the employer, which are redeemable in specified articles of food or wearing apparel at these stores only. The objection could be urged with less force, if a certain part of the wages perhaps were paid in this manner, and all articles allowed were of the best quality and furnished at the very lowest admissible rates. But the facts in the case are, that such store-houses constitute a secondary source of income to the company, necessitating the holders of orders to pay the prices charged and receive the goods in quality as furnished, thus debarring them from making purchases elsewhere on more favorable conditions, and more in keeping with their special wants and tastes. Moreover, numerous wants of a family

can be supplied only by means of cash money, to possess which the holder of scrip is obliged to sell his paper at ruinous discounts, causing an actual loss of wages stipulated and honestly earned. Without fear of contradiction we dispute the moral and legal right of wealthy corporations or individuals thus to deal in false pretenses with their employes, by offering seemingly satisfactory wages, and paying it in depreciated or valueless paper, whilst the double profit is diverted to the pockets of the unrighteous employer to serve as an offering to the idol of extravagance, display and inordinate appetite, "Woe unto him that buildeth his house by unrighteousness and his chambers by wrong; that useth his neighbor's service without wages and giveth him not for his work." Jer. 22, 13.

Such obvious wrongs, and others of a similar nature, on the part of the employers are a blot on the boasted civilization of our enlightened age and a burning shame on the character of a "Christian community." The student of sociology cannot fail to discover in the utter disregard of sacred duties toward *brethren*, by circumstances placed in a position of immediate dependence upon the good faith and sense of justice and equity of one or a few, the causes of convulsions which have menaced the very existence of society and order. They may not be termed the *root* of the evil. This lies imbedded in the sinful forces of our depraved nature and will crop out in fruits of dissatisfaction, selfishness and violence. But the incipient flames of such brands of society could readily be controlled and extinguished under the overwhelming flood of a popular sense of right and the law of self-preservation, were not fuel heaped mountain high by the obvious burden of wrong, under which a whole *class* groans and suffers, until the conflagration threatens to consume both wrong-doer and wronged.

Socialism and anarchism grow from the seeds of sin and unrighteousness within the heart, but they are nurtured and nursed to full stature by injustice, fraud and oppression from without. The science of political economy may suggest means of temporary relief; wise legislation and enforcement of laws may provide a wholesome check within limited bounds; cure can be sought only through the regenerating power of the Gospel. A scriptural conception of duty, an unselfish regard for our fellow-men as brethren, a living and life-inspiring spirit of justice and charity are the forces which must enter the lists and carry the fight to victory.

Were we to dismiss the discussion of this point in the hope of having laid open the source of the disease in our social body, with the expectation that a correction of such evils would insure the harmony between the contending forces of capital and labor and remove the destructive consequences of labor agitations, one would be compelled to plead guilty to prejudice or wanton blindness. We acknowledge and deplore the just cause of complaint for many and grievous wrongs under which the laboring classes are made to suffer. But we are not willing to become a party to counter wrongs, and attempt to palliate the many follies and obvious errors to which working-men as a class are addicted, and which furnish ample auxiliaries to the deplorable contest between capital and labor.

If justice and equity are made requirements in the capitalist, the laborer is bound by the same moral obligations. If we appeal to charity in the wealthy, we cannot release the Christian of humbler means from the same divine duty. If we scourge the sin of extravagance, display, waste, indulgence in sinful appetites in the rich, we

likewise must hold the more humbler members of society accountable for a wise and useful expenditure of his scantier resources.

It is but a fair question to put to laboring men, whether as a rule they employ their time and skill in the service of their masters with that earnestness and fidelity which they have a right to exact? Whether they as a rule exercise that care and circumspection in the use of their employer's property, which they would apply to their private affairs? Whether they as a class allow that spirit of charity to govern their actions, which they unhesitatingly would accord to an embarrassed friend? Not unfrequently great enterprises, through various causes acting together mischievously, are placed in a condition of temporary inability to discharge their obligations with promptness and regularity. Often they are compelled to refuse an advance of wages under stress of losses or dullness of the market, or even diminish the same in order to continue to give employment to their force. It is a notable fact, that dissatisfied labor never hesitates to urge (perhaps just) claims with utmost vehemence and uncompromising severity in just such cases, where a spirit of charity would willingly assume a part of the burden of its employer. "Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ. Not with eyeservice as menpleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the heart. With good will doing service, as to the Lord and not to men, knowing that whatsoever good thing any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord whether he be bond or free." Eph. 6, 5-8.

A more serious and widespread cause, however, of dis-

satisfaction and consequent agitation among laborers will be found in the constant growth of alleged needs and indulgence in luxuries, entirely out of proportion to the income, and unwarranted by the social position and responsibilities incumbent upon the laboring classes. We concede the right and advocate earnestly the duty of every head of the family to make the home the center of attraction for every member of the household. We admire a refinement of taste, which would beautify the daily surroundings and lend an air of comfort and restfulness to the family gathering-place. The hearth should be the focus from which all noble and gentle impulses radiate and to which all pleasant memories and elevating thoughts flow back as to their source. Such impressions absorbed by the child, crystalized into habits in the youth and rationally accepted and lived out by the matured, are a most potent factor in the future development and healthy tone of a community.

But in this, as in everything else, there is a golden mean which must circumscribe the character and extent of the means employed to accomplish the end. The actual outlay in money required to impart a cheerful atmosphere of some comfort to the generally limited space occupied by families of laboring men, if wisely expended, is exceedingly small, tidiness and cleanliness taking the first rank in the category of cheapest decorations. Yet few men find the courage to set their face resolutely against the universal weakness to ape the neighbor in a display of furniture or dress which he perhaps can afford, the indulgence of which, however, for the imitator, is a destructive drain on his resources.

Furthermore, we assert without fear of contradiction, that fully one-fourth of the wages of the average laborer

is absolutely wasted in so-called "amusements" and habits which, far from offering true intellectual recreation or profit, or subserving the stimulation and recuperation of exhausted physical power, are as destructive for both as they are wasteful of material wealth. Take away the patronage of just this class of persons who earn their daily bread with toiling hands and brain, from theatrical, minstrel and like entertainments of positive immoral and degrading influence; prune the custom of this very class from the resources of the saloon and grog shop with its vice-imbued surroundings and enervating poison and hundreds of millions of dollars annually will be added to the home bank to cheer the heart of husbands and gladden the eye of anxious wives. If workingmen would but learn to take care of the cents, by abstaining from useless and even harmful and degrading diversions and habits, the dollars would soon take care of themselves. "But godliness with contentment is great gain. For we brought nothing into the world and it is certain we can carry nothing out, and having food and raiment let us be therewith content." 1 Tim. 6, 6-8. "Let us walk honestly as in the day, not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ and make not provision for the flesh, to fulfill the lusts thereof." Rom. 13, 13. 14.

The great panacea for the removal of the troubles, of which workingmen are frequently the victims, has in our days been sought in organized unions of trades and labor associations of various denominations. The weapons wielded are organized efforts to support the demands for increase of wages, establishment of uniform rights, decrease of working hours, etc.; strikes to enforce demands where not readily conceded; boycott, violence and destruction of property.

These phases of the labor question have assumed such overshadowing proportions, especially in our country, and have assimilated elements of lawlessness and revolutionary tendencies to such an alarming degree, that in some of their more radical features they have become the subject for judicial investigation and legislative action. The matter is of sufficient importance to merit extensive treatment and to call forth the best efforts of the philanthropist and the student of sociology. We purpose in this connection to set forth only a few guiding principles for Christian workingmen, by which they may determine what course to take in order to stem the evil tide which on its billows carries along the dread demon of disorder and anarchism.

A right to form organizations for all proper and legitimate purposes must be conceded to laboring-men as well as others. Such purposes may embrace greater facilities for increasing proficiency in the various trades and avocations, opportunities for more extended advancement of general knowledge and culture; innocent, refreshing and exhilarating amusements, mutual encouragement and assistance in various ways, and the like. As soon as such organized bodies, however, assume any dictatorial powers whatever over the individual liberty of others outside of that corporation for the purpose of intimidation, of enforcing arbitrary demands, of exercising violence and inflicting injury; as soon as they demand of their own members unquestioning submission to orders and directions, which restrict their individual liberty to act according to their conscience, causing them thereby to become a party to injustice, injury and lawlessness, — such organizations are in principle revolutionary of the organic law of our nation, destructive of all moral instincts and utterly subversive of the fundamental principles of Christianity.

A laborer may quit work for an employer on grounds which he can justify before his conscience; but by no method of reasoning has he the right to prevent another's employment under conditions suitable and satisfactory to the parties concerned. An employer has the liberty to discharge or not to engage an employe for reasons satisfactory to himself and justified by his sense of right and utility; no corporation or body of men has a legal or moral right to enforce the employment of men agreeable to them, but obnoxious to the interests of the employer. No association of men has any right to call a man from his work against his will, because a majority may decide to lay down the tools. In a word, no man or body of men has any right whatever to hamper, restrict or prevent any other in the free exercise of his duties as employer or employe, or power to dictate terms by which the exercise of such freedom is imperiled or hindered. Any assumption of such power, whether arbitrarily applied, or delegated by vote or guaranteed by written instrument is unchristian and sinful. "For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another." Gal. 5, 13.

No Christian who is fully conscious of the liberty of conscience to which he is called through Christ Jesus, and who recognizes the same liberty of his brother, can for a moment sell this glorious heritage of his Master into the abject slavery required by the avowed and demonstrated principles of labor unions. All organizations with such principles, be they Knights of Labor, Trades Unions, Labor Unions or of whatsoever high-sounding and delusive titles, menacing as they are to our civil liberty, are utterly destructive of the law of charity which forms the basis for a

Christian's intercourse with his neighbor. No true Christian dare therefore jeopardize his faith by becoming a member or maintaining membership in such associations, by sacrificing his own Christian liberty and placing the yoke of bondage upon his brethren.

We believe that an effective cure for the threatening danger can be expected only from the enlightening and regenerating power of the Gospel, and we are convinced that it is the duty of the pulpit to face the question with more earnestness and vigor. Let the great mass of Christian workingmen be brought to realize the truth and submit to the great Master's will, and the siren voice of the unprincipled agitator together with the loud vociferations of blatant demagogues will be relegated to the obscure corners of our land, and peace and prosperity will continue to hover over our beloved nation.

T. M.

MISSION WORK AMONG THE JEWS.

"He came unto His own, and they that were His own received Him not." John 1, 11. With these words the prologue of the fourth Gospel records one of the most fatal events in the annals of time. The Israelites were the chosen people, selected by God from among the Gentile nations, in order that He might educate them for His divine purposes, when, in the fulness of time, the Word should become flesh and the Gospel of promise become a Gospel of history. Through their own sin and their misconstruction of the prophetic promises, Israel rejected the Lord, and thus became unfaithful to its historical mission. But this treachery

on the part of the chosen people did not make God faithless. His plans were to be accomplished notwithstanding the sins of men. And the salvation brought by Christ was offered to the Jews who rejected Christ as the Messiah, as well as to the Gentiles. Indeed it was offered to them first, in a sense deeper and wider than mere priority of time. Christ's whole ministration of three years was one continued prosecution of Jewish mission work; it was an earnest endeavor to make Israel in the flesh also Israel in the spirit. When after the first Pentecost the Gospel work went out conquering and to conquer, its promulgation was first restricted to Israel. Indeed the sentiment seemed to prevail even in Apostolic circles, that this Gospel was intended only for Israel, and not for the unclean Gentiles. Even in the case of Peter it required a special symbolical revelation from heaven to teach him that the Gospel was intended also for Cornelius and with him the Gentile world in general. Paul's work among the nations, not undertaken until his efforts among the Jews had proved abortive, was an offense to many of the early Christians, and it required an Apostolic convention in Jerusalem to settle this fundamental matter. Cf. Acts 15. Thus the beginnings of the Apostolic Gospel work was essentially mission work among Israel in the flesh. To some extent at least this is true also of the literary work of these evangelists. While all of the New Testament writings could be and were used to advantage for the evangelization of Jew as well as Gentile, some of them are written chiefly with an eye to the needs of the former. Thus we have among the Gospels that of Matthew, and among the Epistles, the letter to the Hebrews.

In this way by precept and example the New Testament inculcates the lesson of Jewish mission. Not only

has the Church the general call to make disciples of all the nations of the world, but there are special reasons why the recall of Israel to the household of faith should be considered one of her most sacred duties. Even if the words of Paul, Rom. 11, 26, may not refer to Israel in the flesh, and notwithstanding the fact that the history of the Church has shown this to be the most difficult of all mission work, yet the Word of the Lord has not returned and will not return entirely void when applied to the hearts of this stubborn people.

It must be confessed that the Church has never been fully alive to this duty toward the once favored people of God. The Church has in her possession the spiritual inheritance of Israel, but has never made such efforts to give back of this inheritance as she has to spread its light among the lands of spiritual darkness. The early records of the Church do not bring us tidings of persistent efforts in this direction after the Apostolic age. The Gentile people were so hungry for the bread of life, the Jews were so determined to be satisfied with the husks and stones of human opinions, that the early evangelists found it a much more thankful task to preach to the former than to argue with the latter. Then the second destruction of the temple and the utter devastation of Jerusalem, as also the direful results of the Jewish rebellion under Bar-Cocheba against the Emperor Hadrian scattered the Jews to the four corners of the globe, and made them socially and religiously the most despised of nations. Horace, Juvenal, Suetonius and other satirists of the day found in them an abundance of material of their keenest wit. They were the Cain among the nations, marked with ostracism and disgrace. Then it is also apparent from the Christian literature of the times that in most Christian circles the Jews were looked at rather as the stubborn rebels against Christ and as His murderers, than as the object of earnest missionary zeal. With these facts on hand it is not difficult to see why so little was done in the early Christian centuries for the spiritual welfare of Israel.

Nor did matters improve much during the middle ages. We indeed read of quite a number of conversions from Judaism to Christianity in those days, but it is only too true that the great majority of them were brought about either through fear of persecution or through a desire for some earthly advantage. The means resorted to by the authorities of the Church to effect this end were neither honorable to them themselves, nor conceived or carried out in the spirit of the Gospel.*

The Church of the Reformation was not a missionary church. The leaders in that great movement may have been (and some were) fully conscious of their duty in this regard, but no doubt the great needs of the present in their own homes and countries prevented their doing for the heathen what otherwise they would have done. We know from some words of Luther that he recognized also the need of Gospel work among the Jews, but we know also that the Church of the Reformation did little or nothing in this regard.

The present is the greatest missionary century in the history of the Church. Never since the Apostolic age have such systematic efforts been put forth all along the line for the prosecution of this noble work as in our own day and date. And under the blessing of God the work has progressed visibly, and thousands are being plucked each year as brands from the fire. The wonders of this century of wonders are not complete without the almost miracle of the mission work and success of our times.

And to this belongs also the cause of Jewish missions. The first determined effort, however, in this direction was made already in the second and third decade of the last century. It was one of the many blessings that resulted from the Pietistic movement that centered in Halle. John Henry Collenberg was a favorite pupil of August Hermann Francke, the founder of the famous Orphans Home in Halle. He was a devoted student of Hebrew and soon felt keenly

* Cf. for particulars, the second edition of Herzog's *Real-Encyclopaedia*, article "Mission unter den Juden." Vol. X, p. 102-118.

the duty of bringing the Gospel to the Jews. He organized a society, composed chiefly of theological students, at Halle, called the *Institutum Judaicum et Mohamedicum*, for the purpose of publishing and spreading the Gospel intelligence among the Israelites. He was nobly seconded by his Halle friends, and, considering the circumstances, did an excellent work for the Lord. He was, however, a *vox clamantis*, whose appeal to the conscience of the Church resounded without being heeded.* When rationalism swept over the land of Luther and devastated the fair fields of Evangelical Germany, it destroyed also this tiny plant of faith, whose seed, however, had fallen into good ground and has in our own times sprung up again bearing fruit, thirty, sixty and a hundred fold.

With the present century began a new era in Jewish missions. Societies were organized for Gospel work among Israel; books and pamphlets were published and scattered, missionaries were educated and sent out to all the lands of the Jewish dispersion, until now it can be said that the Gospel is being brought to all those of Israel who are willing to listen. The first society of the kind that was established was the "London Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews," organized in 1808, chiefly through the influence of the German Jewish proselyte Frey. It is still the largest of many associations of the same kind. It labors at 35 stations and employs 141 agents. Its men are engaged in many places in Europe, Asia and Africa, chiefly in Jerusalem and Abyssinia. In 1880 the Mission of the Scotch Church was organized, and in 1842 the British Jewish Society, the second in size after London. Its agents are found in England, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Switzerland, Russia, Turkey, and North Africa. The Scotch Free Church established a similar organization in 1843, and has been very successful, especially in Constantinople. The Presbyterians of England, of Scotland, and of Ireland have each societies of this kind, while the London City Missions

* A full description of this movement is found in the *Lutheran Standard* for November 8, 1884.

does work of a similar character. On the Continent the Berlin Society was the first to be established, which took place in 1822. Tholuck was for many years its chief advisor. This society is ably seconded by the "Association for the Christian Care of Jewish Proselytes." In 1843 the "Rhenish and Westphalian Society for Israel" was established, and ten years before already the Swiss Society in Basel. About twenty-four years ago a similar organization was established by the Dutch Church in Amsterdam, while the Swedish and other Scandinavian organizations have been laboring chiefly in conjunction with the German Societies. In other European countries apparently nothing has been done for this work, at least nothing from the Protestant side. Among the many American denominations only two seem to take an interest in the cause, namely the Episcopalian and the Lutheran. The former have it as one of the recognized features of their general Church work, while in the latter it is done entirely by separate bodies and not by the Church in general. The most prominent man in this connection is probably Pastor Werber, of Baltimore, who is laboring under a Norwegian body. He publishes a German monthly called "Der Freund Israels." The Missouri Synod has a proselyte engaged in the work in New York city, who reports fair progress from time to time, and the General Synod, or certain portions of it, have a man in Chicago for this work.

Within the last few years, however, great prominence has been given to the Jewish mission cause by the labors of that veteran friend of the Jews, Prof. Franz Delitzsch, of Leipzig, and his friends, in connection with a remarkable movement among the Jews of Bessarabia, a province of Southern Russia, which, under the direction of a learned lawyer, Joseph Rabinowitz, has taken a decided Christian and evangelical tendency and turn. Delitzsch, in connection with the "Evangelical Lutheran Central Association for Mission Work among the Jews," has for many years been preaching this cause to the Church of the Fatherland, but never has he found so many willing ears and hearts and hands as within the past five years. A decided impetus to

the work was given by the reorganization of the old Halle *Institutum Judaicum* among the students of the University at Leipzig. Its aim was and is to study Jewish literature, to awaken an interest in Jewish missions, and, as far as possible, to send men out into this harvest-field. The acorn planted at Leipzig is fast becoming a mighty oak, and such societies are now found at nine German Universities, with a membership of over three hundred, while similar societies have been organized in the Scandinavian countries. They have organized themselves into a general body, which has sent out men to Southern Russia, has published excellent books and pamphlets on this subject, and now is about to establish a seminary at Leipzig in which young men are to be educated for this important work.

A number of factors have conspired to make this a most favorable opportunity for this peculiar task. Not only the general mission zeal of our times, but other special agencies have prepared the way. First and foremost among these is the Hebrew translation of the New Testament by Professor Delitzsch, and published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. This is the result of forty years of incessant toil by the leading high-priest of the world. There were Hebrew New Testaments before this translation, but none were satisfactory from a literary point of view. And the history of Jewish missions have proved, that the Jews, especially those in the East where the Hebrew is still the sacred and literary language of the people, can be approached for religious discussion only through the medium of their own language. The success of this version has simply been phenomenal. Seven stereotype editions, in about 40,000 copies, have been issued, fully ninety per cent of which have gone to the Jews of Eastern Europe and Western Asia. From reports received from those regions it is evident, that this New Testament is doing a great work for Christ among the Jews, and has lead many to recognize in Jesus of Nazareth the Messiah promised by Moses and the prophets.

Another factor in this work is the Jewish Christian movement under the leadership of Rabinowitz. It does not

stand in the relation of effect and cause to the translation of the New Testament just described, but it has been materially influenced and advanced by this version. Rabinowitz is a prominent lawyer in the city of Kischneff, and in the interests of his people visited the Holy Land about four or five years ago. He had been a student of the New Testament, and while in Palestine came to the conviction that "the key to the Holy Land lies in the hands of our brother Jesus," accordingly his watchword became "Jesus, our Brother." Upon his return he preached Christ or the fulfillment of prophecy, and established a Jewish-Christian congregation upon this basis. He did not connect the work under him with any of the Jewish missions, but it is to the present day an entirely independent movement, probably the first since the days of the Apostles in which a larger body of Jews out of the needs of their own hearts, turn to Christ. The Kischneff Jewish Christians are not yet what the best interests of Evangelical Christians would want them to be, but the spirit and animus of the movement seems to be genuine Biblical in its character.*

It would, of course, be impossible to figure out statistically what the success of Jewish missions has been. Nor is this necessary. It is our business to obey the Lord's command in this regard, and leave the results to Him alone. But as good an authority as the missionary De la Roi, of Breslau, says that in the present century at least 100,000 Jews have been baptized. Faltin, in Kischneff alone has baptized hundreds, and that many of these converts have become noble servants of the Messiah can be seen from such examples as Neander and Philippe in Germany, Kolker, in Denmark, Caspari, in Norway, and many others. Among Israel according to the flesh the field is also white for the harvest and the records of this great missionary century are proving, that many among the chosen people are saved through the power of the Gospel their fathers rejected.

G. H. S.

* A translation of their confessions can be found in the *Lutheran Quarterly*, July, 1886, pp. 378-390.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.

APRIL, 1887.

No. 2.

“THE NEW THEOLOGY.”

SECOND ARTICLE.

Divergent views respecting the object of Christ's coming into the world necessarily lead to corresponding disagreements in regard to the work by which that object was accomplished. Moreover, heresies never go singly ; they will multiply as they move along. When therefore we proceed to examine the teachings of the New Theology on the subject of Christ's work, it will be found that its incarnation theories are by no means as harmless as to some they have appeared ; and besides, that to the errors resulting from them others are added, and among them such as tend to destroy the very heart of saving doctrine.

That the Christian religion, as the communion of God with man and of man with God, is mediated through the person of the God-man and established by His offices of grace, is taught by both sides, and so far are all agreed ; but not in their answers to questions concerning the cause, the character, the availability and application of this mediatorial work. According to the Old Faith this communion—for which man was created and in which he lived while yet in his first estate—was by the fall of man completely destroyed, so that its re-establishment by Christ was the restoration of something entirely lost, a replacement for a rela-

tion of hatred and enmity between man and God by a relation of love and friendship between them. This the New Faith in part denies; for while it admits that on the side of the sinner and by him fellowship with God was rendered impossible, it yet asserts that sin did not necessitate God wholly to turn away from man, much less to set Himself against man; so that here the restoration of the fellowship lost is viewed as the repair of something merely broken, the readjustment of a relation simply disturbed: in other words, through the work of Christ man is again disposed for and enabled to enter into communion with God, God's disposition for such communion, though somewhat hindered, never having ceased or undergone any radical change. Again, while the Old Faith looks upon the Savior as the sinner's Substitute in the most literal sense of the term, and accordingly interprets the Savior's work, the New Faith sees in Him the Head and Representative of the race and takes account of His work from this point of view. Then, in full consistency with this last difference, another one results with reference to the way men are made partakers of Christ and His merits; this namely, that while on the side of the former school chief stress is laid on faith as an apprehending means, the latter, almost ignoring this feature of it, emphasizes it as an incorporative life-power.

Such, in their most general outline, are the distinctive doctrines of the New Theology on the work of Christ. Compared with those of the Church, they are not distinctive doctrines only, but such as stand in direct opposition to the Christian faith, either in themselves or by reason of the place assigned to them in the order of salvation. "Progressive Orthodoxy" the propagation of such views is called by its friends and advocates progressive heterodoxy it is, and of

the most dangerous species. But to make it clearly appear what really it is, requires a closer scrutiny of its more particular features, and of its dextrous handling.

2. THE ATONEMENT.

How exceedingly sinful sin is, and how abhorrent to the heart of God, of that is no man made fully sensible, excepting Him whom we all have made to serve with our sins and wearied with our iniquities, even Christ Jesus who Himself the true God was made a little lower than the angels, and by love unspeakable tasted death for every man. That God for His own sake no less than on man's account is, humanly speaking, deeply affected by sin, lies in the nature of the case and is revealed by His every word concerning sin as also by all His dealings with it and with the sinner. Sin so offends the holiness of God and does violence to His justice, that He must hate and curse where otherwise He is pleased only to love and bless. But this love is turned to mercy, and mercy would save the sinner, if, in justice to the Divine Self, the sinner can be saved. Except it be holy and righteous withal, saving love is impossible with God. Were He to love what by His holy nature He is constrained to hate, then would He simply deny Himself and cease to be the holy and perfect God that He is. And yet there is that in Him which moves Him to damn the sinner, and there is that in Him which moves Him to save the sinner. Impossible as it is for sin to enter as much as into the presence of God and in the least to disorder the absolute harmony of His being or in any way to disturb His ineffable blessedness, yet does the curse of the evil in some way extend to the very heart of God and there in His innermost life produce a sort of antagonism in His attitude toward the guilty

creature—wholly unable as we are to understand it. Love and mercy on the one hand, holiness and justice on the other, and a sinful world between them: such is the awful antithesis brought about by sin in the mind of God. And it is most real, little as our anthropomorphic way of thinking may help us to see into its true character. Its reality is attested by every word of the Bible, by the entire revelation of God following the fall of man, and by the whole history of the world.

On the one hand there is not a word expressive of displeasure but what God employs it to manifest His enmity toward sin: hatred and anger, wrath and vengeance, abomination and loathing, fury and condemnation—all are used to reveal the attitude of God toward all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men. Moreover, every pain that the flesh is susceptible of, every care that racks the brain, every fear that dismays the heart, every bitterness of soul, the remorse of conscience, the despair that maddens, the throes of death, the torments of hell, in short, every evil that may be named—all, as the fruits of sin, make us feel how thoroughly God abominates the evil that begets them. Add to this what in the fulness of time He has done to condemn it and to undo its evil workings, and who can doubt but what His hatred and punishment of sin are most real and a necessity grounded in His very nature. “In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die!” and again: “The soul that sinneth, it shall die!” thus reads the dreadful sentence which by reason of His holiness He must pronounce, and which to satisfy His justice He must execute also.

On the other hand no less real and fundamental to His nature is the divine love that would save the sinner. “It is of the Lord’s mercy that we are not consumed, because His

compassions fail not. They are new every morning: great is Thy faithfulness." Lam. 3, 22-23. "The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He will not always chide; neither will He keep His anger forever. He hath not dealt with us after our sins; nor rewarded us according to our iniquities. For as the heaven is high above the earth, so great is His mercy toward them that fear Him. As far as the east is from the west, so far hath He removed our transgressions from us. Like as a father pitith his children, so the Lord pitith them that fear Him." Ps. 103. "Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel!" Ezek. 33, 11. That we, sinners though we are, still live and have not perished in our sins, that despite the fear and dread which lie at the doors of our hearts these despair not but are hopeful, that amid the untold woe of the world we live in there is still some gladness, yea, that we are and even now know ourselves to be the children of the Holy One whom we have offended and do offend daily, and that we are His heirs, heirs of eternal life—all this is due to the reality of that grace which, where sin abandoned, did much more abound. "O sing unto the Lord a new song: for He hath done marvelous things: His right hand, and His holy arm, hath gotten Him the victory. The Lord hath made known His salvation: His righteousness hath He openly showed in the sight of the heathen. He hath remembered His mercy and His truth toward the house of Israel: all the ends of the earth have seen the salvation of our God." Ps. 98, 1-3.

Has then divine justice suffered defeat at the hands of

divine love in what seems to be a victory of the latter? Has the thrice holy God connived at the wickedness of men and His soul spent itself in loathing of their sins? Has the righteous One forgotten His righteousness and done violence to the law of His own nature? Is the eternal Truth fallen to the ground, or is the arm of the Almighty too short to make good His word? God forbid! none of these things have come to pass. The Lord sheweth mercy to sinners, and He is holy notwithstanding. "But God commendeth His love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us—died for the ungodly." Rom. 5, 8. 6. For "when the fulness of time was come, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 4, 4-5. "Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." λότρου ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Matt. 20, 28. "For Christ also hath suffered for sins, the Just for—the unjust, that He might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit." 1 Pet. 3, 18. As our High-priest, and as the Lamb without blemish and without spot, He offered Himself and was offered once for all to put away sin, Heb. 7, 26-28; 1 Pet. 1, 19; so that "He is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." 1 John 2, 2. "Therefore, as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men unto condemnation; even so by the righteousness of One the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. That as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord." Rom. 5, 18. 21. *To summarize:* God, according to His own free pleasure, so commends His saving love toward

us that Christ, for our benefit— $\delta\pi\acute{e}\rho\ \dot{\chi}\mu\bar{\alpha}\nu$ —and in our stead— $\dot{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{i}$ —and hence as our Substitute, fulfills the law of God and suffers the full penalty of our guilt, and by this vicarious obedience gives His life a ransom— $\lambda\acute{u}\tau\rho\omega\omega$ —for our sins in order on the one hand to satisfy divine justice and on the other to acquire for us the divine favor with all its gifts and graces, inasmuch as His merits are imputed to us for righteousness.

We have thus endeavored to restate the doctrine of atonement as taught by the Scriptures and the Church—and, as much as possible, in terms employed by both—in order to facilitate our comparison with it of the doctrine and phases of doctrine put forward by the New Theology on the same subject. The whole drift of the new school is to explain away the facts that by the merciful will of God Christ was made sin for us, that His suffering was penal and strictly vicarious, that such a sacrifice was demanded to satisfy divine justice, and that the righteousness bestowed on us in our justification is the one acquired by Christ and imputed to us. How they go about their evil work of destruction, and what they propose to substitute for the truths of which they would rob us, we shall now undertake to show.

The exceptions taken by the advocates of the New Theology to the old doctrine of atonement are very pronounced in their character and are, briefly stated, the following. They deny that in consequence of sin and by it the saving love of God and His retributive justice are, with respect to the sinner, put in antithesis; so to distinguish and oppose these divine attributes is declared a mistake, and a very dangerous one at that; on the contrary, grace and righteousness, it is claimed, are both the manifestations of the same divine love to one and the same end, to wit, the

redemption of the sinner. Having thus undermined the foundation to its necessity on the side of God, the reality of a vicarious satisfaction is, in the next place, assailed. As to the active obedience of Christ it is, by some at least, boldly asserted that the Son of man was Himself and for Himself subject to the Law; and as regards His passive obedience it is said that Christ was in no sense an object of the divine anger, that His sufferings and death were not endured to satisfy the demands of divine justice, that in fact the Savior did never really take the place of sinners as their Substitute to appease God and acquire righteousness which can be made available by imputation. "The clearer recognition of ethical truth—says the *Andover Review* of July, 1885, p. 60—as grounded in law and reason, has been accompanied by important modifications in the view of atonement. It is no longer believed* that personal merit or demerit can be transferred from one to another. It is not believed that an exact quantity of punishment can be borne by an innocent for a guilty person. It is not believed that

* And yet do thousands and tens of thousands believe this very thing, believe that the righteousness of Another, even of Christ their Savior, is imputed to them; and with this righteousness and none other do they hope to stand before God and find entrance to His kingdom. Whatever the editors of the *Review* and their friends may think of the character and worth of such a faith, the fact that it is held by countless thousands of christians they cannot deny without either exposing the most inexcusable ignorance or making themselves guilty of the most palpable falsehood. Such sweeping statements are an insult to the Church of the past and present. We can think of no excuse that might be offered in extenuation of it unless it be that the publishers of it are drunk, hopelessly drunk on the "new wine," and therefore know not what they are talking about. Our well-meant advice to them is that they confine themselves to the more innocent waters of the native Shawsheen and abstain, for a while at least and until they shall have become stronger, from the dangerous decoctions of transatlantic doctors.

the consequences of sin can be removed from the transgressor by passing them to another. Conduct, character and condition are inseparable. The results of sin are part of the ethical personality, and cannot be detached, nor borne by another." So again, but by another writer in the same *Review*—Sept. 1886, p. 266,—"It is not, to the unbiased human conscience, ethically possible that the guilt of one man should be removed by the punishment of another innocent one; or that guilt pardoned in this way might not just as well be pardoned without any punishment whatever."

To meet these objections which, could they be maintained, would force us to abandon our present conception of the atonement, it will be necessary to state beforehand that the appeal to law and reason and consciousness* which is made to support them, to us proves little or nothing. Whatever value such subjective factors may have as collateral or confirmatory testimony in questions of Christian doctrine, the force of evidence here belongs wholly and solely to the Scriptures as the only source and standard of the Church's faith. Reason is to be put in subjection to what is written, and by this must the ethical consciousness be moulded before its voice can be heard. That acting on this principle makes neither fools nor knaves nor heretics of men—of that the theology and history of the Church of the Reformation is the best of witnesses. But whither the principle of Scripture and Reason leads—to that Calvinism has furnished a most instructive answer, if men would but

* Least of all the reason and ethical consciousness of men whose way of thinking and sense of right and wrong allow them to teach doctrines contrary to the faith they have solemnly bound themselves to propagate and defend; and who, while engaged in the nefarious business, eat the bread of the Church whose faith they would destroy.

see it and profit by it. With us, therefore, the question is not, what do reason and the moral consciousness of man say, but what says the Word of God on the points in dispute? Knowing what the divine Master has to say, we may safely ignore the opinions of every would-be master among men.

Now the Scriptures, to our knowledge, no more speak of a holy love of God than of a loving holiness;* in no way do they as much as suggest the idea that holiness is merely a particular *modus* of love. In speaking of these divine attributes, be it to characterize the person or the work of God, they invariably discriminate between them as between two distinct though never separate properties. That there is a decided difference and what this difference is, they do not teach us by definition but by the doings which they ascribe to them respectively, that is, by the manifestations of these attributes among men. "In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent His only begotten Son—with whom all things are given us, Rom. 8, 32—into the world, that we might live through Him." 1 John 4, 9. In the light of its own manifestation, therefore, "love is self-communication (*bonum communicationum sui*), devotion or the offering of one's self (*Hingabe*) to another, the transposition of one ego into that of another in order with its own self to interpenetrate, fill and bless this other one, and thus to be, possess and behold itself in the other, without however destroying or losing itself." *Thama-*

*Though inadequate and therefore unsatisfactory, yet are we not inclined to provoke a quarrel with those who hold to the view that holiness is a quality and modification of love, provided this view be not urged for the purpose of weakening the holiness of God in any sense and in any way contrary to the Scriptures—as is done by modern theology.

sius' Christi Person und Werk, I., p. 96, 3. Ed. How very different from this, according to the Bible, is the exercise of divine holiness and its influence on men. For example: The prophet upon seeing the Lord and hearing the seraphims crying one to another: "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts!" exclaims: "Wo is me! for I am undone; because I am a man of unclean lips . . . for mine eyes have seen the King, the Lord of hosts." And he is not quieted until one of the seraphims has laid upon his mouth a live coal from the altar, and said: "Lo, this hath touched thy lips; and thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged." Isa. 6. So when the writer to the Hebrews admonishes his readers to serve God acceptably, he adds: "for our God is a consuming fire." See also 1 Sam. 6, 20; and Isa. 5, 16. "Thou art righteous, O Lord,—says the angel with the vial of God's wrath—because Thou hast judged thus. For they have shed the blood of saints and prophets, and Thou hast given them blood to drink; for they are worthy. And I heard another out of the altar say, Even so, Lord God Almighty, true and righteous are Thy judgments." Rev. 16, 5-8. From such passages it is evident that, in the words of another, "holiness is that purity and harmony of the Deity by which as *ad intra* all contradiction between the divine being and the divine volitions, so also *ad extra* all contamination by contact with sin, is excluded." Or, more practically but not the less correctly, it is that distinct attribute of God by virtue of which He moves and works in absolute righteousness among men, requires these in their entire nature and in their every action to be conformed and to conform to His own nature and will, abominates every transgression of this will, and imperatively demands the full punishment such opposition to Himself

deserves. When exceptionally the bestowal of benefits or even salvation are by the Bible brought in connection with the holiness of God, we need only to remember that this attribute, though distinct from that of saving love, does yet not act separate from it with reference to those who can still be saved. As on the one hand the holiness and truth of God constitute the limits beyond which His love cannot exercise itself, and in so far these may be said to be above love, so on the other hand are these attributes placed in the service of love, inasmuch as through them its safety and vindication are secured; for, as *Philippi* says: "The divine holiness is that relation in which God is put to Himself—*Bezogenheit G's auf sich selbst*—the principle of the divine self-affirmation and of the preservation or protection of self." *Glaub. Lehre*, Vol. II., p. 80, 3. Ed.

As modern theology would so weaken it as to do away with the fundamental distinction existing between love and holiness, so it confounds, quite consistently with itself, the various modifications of these two properties. Righteousness and grace are put down as manifestations of love; God's hatred of sin is said to be but the correlate of His love for the sinner as His creature; and the divine anger is by some declared to be the pain of love, by others a modification of the kindness of God. The object of this whole artful movement is, as the sequel shows, to reduce the evils consequent on sin from punishments to mere visitations such as a loving but aggrieved parent inflicts for correction upon a wayward child. But how very unscriptural this confusion of things and of the names of things is, appears among other considerations from the fact that throughout the entire Word the dire judgments of God, in which His hatred and anger and wrath culminate, are in

the end all ascribed to His holiness or justice; then, that all His dealings with men for purposes of reformation or salvation are ultimately all reduceable to acts of love, of that love which in its various *modi* of mercy, pity, compassion, loving kindness, goodness, grace, etc., glorifies itself among men. And thus does the Bible itself very carefully distinguish between chastisements of love for the purpose of amendment, and chastisements of anger for the doing of wrong. So for example in the words of the prophet: "O Lord, correct me, but with judgment; not in Thine anger, lest Thou bring me to nothing. Pour out Thy fury upon the heathen that know Thee not, and on the families that call not on Thy name." Isa. 10, 24. 25. Finally it must be observed that if the combatted view were the correct one, then were all the ethical attributes of the Deity to be reduced to but one manifesting itself in many ways, and we would be driven to the conclusion that the same love which lifts into heaven the one man casts down into hell the other.

But the chief point here at issue remains, and it resolves itself into this: Is the divine holiness satisfied if, by the influence of threats and promises, of warnings and wooings, of visitations and benefactions, the sinner were induced to turn from his evil ways and made holy, or does it take account of his guilt, demand payment, and if so, what is the nature and extent of this penalty? The answer to this question by the New Theology is clearly a denial of its latter half—how it affirms the former, we shall see further on—a denial, because, made wise by law, reason and the ethical consciousness, it rejects the idea of an equivalent for guilt.

According to the explicit testimony of Scripture and

the Church, God requires of man perfect obedience to His Law and He threatens to punish him who disobeys. Now it is certain that the punishment attached to sinfulness and sins can be neither more nor less than the holiness of God demands; for if it were more or less, then would God act arbitrarily, and then were He not that absolute perfect and harmonious Being "with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." Again, and with respect to His dealings with the sinner: if the punishment were more, then were He unjust to the guilty; and if less, then were He in a manner merciful to men but cruel to Himself, inasmuch as He would thus violate His own innate law of righteousness. Besides, He has fixed the penalty of sin, and made solemn declaration that He will inflict it; therefore in faithfulness to Himself as the absolute Truth the punishment must be exacted. But, it might be asked here, is God not almighty, and can He not do as He pleases? We answer: He can do what He will, but He never wills anything contrary to Himself and to the perfect law in and of His own being. Thanks be to God, the penalty can be remitted, so that we need not bear it; but this has nothing to do with the justice and magnitude of it; nor does it follow from the remission, that the penalty need not be and that it was not endured. Therefore the Savior would have us to apply the words of the parable: "And his Lord was wroth, and delivered him to the tormentors, till he should pay all that was due unto him." Matt. 18, 23, 34, 35. And again; Luke 12, 59: "I tell thee, thou shalt not depart thence, till thou hast paid the very last mite." "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." 2 Cor. 5, 10. Matt. 16, 27.

Next then, what is the penalty due to our guilty condition and life? That there are degrees of punishment as there are degrees of guilt, there can be little doubt—see Job 8, 3; Rev. 19, 2; Luke 12, 47-48, and 2 Cor. 5, 10—; but sins, whether little or great, few or many, entail eternal death, reprobation and torments. Whereas sin is an offense against an infinite Being, an infinite punishment is required to wipe it out. “The wages of sin is death,” Rom. 6, 23—spiritual, bodily and eternal death. That this is said of sin as such without reference to it in point of number and weight, is evident from Rom. 5, 12 and 16, where we are told that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;” and then, that this “judgment was by one to condemnation” *εἰς κατάχριστα*.

Much as the new divinity men pretend to be led by the moral consciousness and endeavor to operate with such data as might be derived from it, yet is their own sense of right and wrong blind and dull, both as to the supreme holiness of God and the exceeding heinousness of man’s sin. For denying, as they do, the penal and vicarious character of the life and death of Christ, they are driven to the conclusion, either that sin does not deserve and that the holiness of God really has not imposed on sin “the judgment unto condemnation,” or that the truth of God in the case of the saved has never exacted it. Since the wages of sin is death in the most intensive and extensive sense of the term, and since therefore no mere man can pay it except he be cast forever from the presence of God into outer darkness and damnation, the guilty conscience, in order to have peace and hope, demands to know whether the penalty of its guilt is paid by Christ or not. Every man morally alive to the

law of God knows that he himself has not paid it; and if another have not paid it for him, then must he despair and perish in his sins; or if pointed to the vain hope that the God of holiness and truth may not exact it, then does he lose his God for one that is false, and so again are his feet set on the way to damnation.

No, what the holiness of God demands and the sinner owes, that Christ his Savior has secured and paid for him. Weaken the holiness of God, and you weaken the grace that is in Christ Jesus to satisfy it; detract from the guilt and penalty of sin, and you deprecate the merit of Christ. Truth or error on the one side lead to truth or error on the other. When therefore we turn our attention to the Savior's work as set forth in the Gospel, we do not only expect to see our doctrine of sin and of God's attitude toward it confirmed, but to see exposed at the same time the utter fallacy of the New Theology in its soteriological negations, to wit: that Christ is not our Substitute, that His sufferings are not penal and endured to satisfy the demands of justice on us, and that the righteousness thus acquired is not transferable. The doctrine of literal substitution is so plainly taught in the Scriptures that we have all but the name of it. To "the unbiased human conscience" which is at all awakened to a sense of God's holiness on the one hand and of man's guilt on the other, it is easily made plain that as in this and in no other way the wrath of God could be appeased and the sinner's justification be secured, so in this was the reconciliation of God to man and of man to God effected also. "For He hath made Him to be sin for us, ὅπερ οὐκ ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in Him." 2 Cor. 5, 21. That this should mean that the sinless Godman was infected with the sinful-

ness of our own depraved nature, or—as has been suggested—that the principle of sin was of God implanted in His human nature, are thoughts so revolting and so diametrically opposed to every true concept of God and His doings, that they cannot be entertained for a moment. He who knew no sin was made not sinful but sin for us in this that sin which was not His own was laid on Him, was so imputed to Him that He was rendered accountable for it. Less than that the language, which is so very strong, cannot mean. The sin thus laid on Him was our sin; hence *ὑπὲρ ιματίου*, for us, for our benefit, in our behalf was He “made sin.” But to what end? That we might be made the righteousness of God in Him *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ*. How the imputation of our sin to Christ is made to end in the imputation of His righteousness to us, is stated not here but elsewhere; nor does that concern us just now, since the point to be made here is that Christ is our Substitute; and this is plainly implied here. For since sin is placed on Him He is certainly the Bearer of sin; and whereas the sin borne by Him is our sin, He is for us and in our place the Bearer of sin—our Substitute. That this is the force of *ὑπὲρ* and of *περί* in all passages where Christ’s saving relation to the sinner and his sin is expressed by these prepositions is put beyond all doubt by such passages as Matt. 20, 28; Mark 10, 45 and 1 Tim. 2, 1—comp. also Matt. 16, 26—where *ἀντὶ* is used and which denotes instead or in place of. “Whether *ἀντὶ πολλῶν*, Matt. 20, 28, be connected with *λύτρων*, which is most natural, or with *δόντων*, is (contrary to *Hoffmann, Schriftbeweiss* II. 1. p. 300) as to the meaning of *ἀντὶ* wholly indifferent. Its meaning is in either case specifically and pointedly determined by *λύτρων* as expressive of *substitution* in which the ransom enters as an equivalent for him whose pardon is purchased:

a view which is everywhere confirmed by the New Testament presentation which, wherever it intents to particularize the real significance of this ransom, speaks of it as a *sacrifice of atonement.*" So Meyer on this passage: and this *Kommentar* can certainly not be said to have been written in the interest of the old school theology. Then, too, does this doctrine of substitution not only stand in full harmony with the idea of sacrifice as set forth throughout the Word of God, but the sacrificial idea imperatively demands this mode of views, inasmuch as the sacrifices of the O. T. dispensation were but the shadows of Christ their substance. But now by the best authorities* on the subject, were the sacrificial victims the substitutes of those who brought them, and hence can the Lamb slain for us be nothing other in this respect than were the lambs prefiguring Him in an economy of God's own appointment; to wit: a Substitute for the sinner whose peace is to be procured.

That the Savior is the sinner's Substitute is furthermore confirmed by the answer which the Scriptures give to the question, How, as such, He rendered account to God for our sins. Their answer is a double one. He was "made under the law" for us in the first place in order by his active obedience to meet its positive requirements. He was "made under the law" not, as some would have it, for Himself,

* "That the laying on of hands," for example, "in the offering of a sacrifice of atonement signified the imputation of guilt, is the traditional conception which both the Jewish Synagogue and the Christian Church have of it; and this view is held to this day by the most of modern theologians even of the most divers theological tendencies:—by Hengstenberg, Haevernick, Keil, Delitzsch, Ebrard, Kliefoth; by Neumann, Tholuck, Stoeckl; by Gesenius, Winer, Knobel, etc." *Philippi. Glaub. Lehre.* Vol. 4, p't 2, p. 247, 2d Ed. Against such an array of authorities, the appeal to Baehr by the writer in the *Andover Review* amounts to nothing.

but "to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons." Gal. 4, 4-5; Rom. 10, 4; Comp. Matt. 5, 17-18 and Luke 16, 17. So strongly does the divine Word urge this particular import, purpose and effect of Christ's holy living, that every attempt on our part to conciliate God by deeds of the Law has the contrary effect of the one desired. "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are (would be) justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Gal. 5, 4. Yea, "as many as are of the works of the law, are under the curse." Ib. 3, 10. But this holy life of Christ again has a twofold significance: it is vicarious unto our justification, and it is exemplary to our sanctification. The good He did as required by the law of us, we have done through Him who has taken our place, and thus are we accounted of as persons obedient to the law. But that same holy and substitutionary doing is intended also to teach and move us, who have been justified by it, unto personal obedience; and in speaking of it the Scriptures sometimes point us to this latter feature of it only. Remembering this its double meaning and purpose, we shall escape the fatal error which would recognise only the latter sanctifying value of it. The other heresy, that Christ was for Himself subject to the law is no doubt a conclusion from historian premises. The Godman as such and aside from His mission among men, is, even as is the Deity, a law to Himself; and only in so far as this innate personal law and that of the decalogue are identical, does He for Himself also live in conformity with the latter; beyond this, He lived by Moses' law only as our Savior. The Godman, considered apart from His office, was not subject to God's commandments as we are. Being the King of kings, for example, and the Lord of lords, what could obligate

Him to do the bidding of Mary and Joseph, of Caiphas or of Pilate? As the almighty Maker of heaven and earth, how can He covet or steal, seeing that all things are His? No, it is only when the double error is committed which separates the Godman into God and Man, and thus makes of the man so separated a person and one of our species, that thoughts so crude and blasphemous can enter the mind.

Christ was “made under the law” in the second place in order by His passive obedience to atone for our guilt; for the full requirement of the law is, not obedience *or*, but obedience *and* punishment for every non-conformance to it both in our natures and lives. From the first to the last breath of our Savior’s earthly life, there was in this an element of suffering culminating in His death on the cross. This element of passion is therefore especially emphasized also, and its penal and vicarious character closely pointed out. Gal. 3, 13, we are told that “Christ hath redeemed— $\xi\pi\eta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\sigma\tau\epsilon\nu$ —bought from or out of—us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us— $\delta\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\;\dot{\chi}\mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\;\chi\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$: for it is written”—Deut. 21, 23—“Cursed”—of God—“is every one that hangeth on a tree.” Combining this declaration with that of 2. Cor. 5, 21, it becomes divinely evident, *a*) that the merciful God by imposing on the beloved Son our sin, with it transfers to Him His own anger and His curse of sin; *b*) that the Son, being made a curse and suffering the evils it imprecates, thereby appeases the wrath of God and removes or undoes the curse; and *c*) that the curse endured being the curse of God on our sin, its endurance is the equivalent with which the Savior procures our release from the wrath of God and the punishment it demanded.

That these are truths most literal and real, and facts so very bitter and yet inexpressibly comforting and sweet to the

soul, is put beyond all doubt by other passages of the divine Word, yea by the entire Gospel both of promise and of history. To vent His hatred of sin and to spend His anger on the sinner, the holy God turns away from the Son of His Love, on whom lay the weight of a sinful world. "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me!" Matt. 27, 46. And this too in the hour of most heartrending anguish. "I am poured out like water, and all my bones are out of joint; my heart is like wax: it is melted in the midst of my bowels. My strength is dried up like a potsherd; and my tongue cleaveth to my jaws; and Thou hast brought me into the dust of death. For dogs have compassed me; the assembly of the wicked have inclosed me: they pierced my hands and my feet. I may tell all my bones: they look and stare upon me. They part my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture. But be not Thou far from me, O Lord: O my strength, haste Thou to help me!" Ps. 22. Thus did He who knew no sin "His own self bare our sins* in His own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." "And we shall say unto Him, What are these wounds in Thy hands? Then He shall answer, Those with which I was wounded in the house of my friends." Zech. 13. 6. "Surely He hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem Him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But He was wounded for our transgressions, He was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon Him; and with His stripes we are healed.

* "This suffering of *punishment* on the part of Christ the Servant of God is such that those for whose sins He endures the punishment are released from punishment, hence a vicarious punishment." Meyer on this passage.

All we like sheep have gone astray ; we have turned every one His own way ; and the Lord hath laid on Him the iniquity of us all." Isa. 53.

The vicarious import of this His penal suffering and death is then especially brought out also by the fact that such willing sacrifice of Himself is declared to be a ransom —λύτρον—with which He, raised from the dead and standing in the presence of God, purchases us to be a people all His own. See Matt. 20, 28; 1 Cor. 6, 20 and 7, 23; Gal. 4, 5; Eph. 1, 7; 1 Tim. 2, 6, and Rev. 5, 9. Not to the devil as, curiously enough, it was at one time thought was this purchase-money paid, but to God Himself; more particularly, to God as the holy and offended One, as the Giver and Vindicator of the law, and as the righteous Judge and Avenger of all sin. True, by infidelity to his God and moral suicide on his own part and by soul-theft and murder on the part of the devil, the sinner finds himself in the hands of his satanic captor and keeper; but never as lawful spoil; for he is, and shall ever remain, the creature and property of his Maker. But on account of his shameful disloyalty and rebellion is he by the law of the kingdom where he belongs put under the curse and condemnation of that law to which the devil is suffered to act as a sort of executioner. It is plain, then, that the ransom for the sinner's release is paid to the divine justice which he has offended. Therefore is liberty now proclaimed to the captives—Isa. 61, 1; 1, 27 and 49, 25; Luke 4, 18—"forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed—ελυτρώθητε=released by purchase—with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." 1 Pet. 2, 18-19. "*Accipe Unigenitum meum et da pro te!*"

saith the Father to thee; and the Son saith: “*Tolle me et redime te!*”

“Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends,” says He who, O love most wonderful and divine! laid down His life for His enemies, in order through His death to reconcile them to God and by His life to save them. John 10, 15 and Rom. 5, 10. The Church of God is fundamentally a *purchased* people, “*purchased with His own blood*,” Acts 20, 28; “for ye are bought with a price.” 1 Cor. 6, 20. This is the Gospel of God, the faith of His Church and the song of His saints in heaven. “And they sing a new song, saying, Worthy art Thou to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: for Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth.” Rev. 5, 9-10. R. V. “It is true, very true, that the mystery peculiar to the doctrine of atonement lies in the substitutionary factor and concept of it, and that by no human analogies can this mystery be rendered intelligible to reason and be made to appear justifiable to the moral consciousness, except by approximation. But then, atonement were not an object of faith if it were not a mystery. The positive comprehension of it being one of faith, is necessarily progressive and does not ripen into understanding by sight until the beyond is reached. Such objections, however, as finite reason may set up against the divine act of atonement, attested as it is by the Word and sealed by the Holy Ghost and by our faith, can even here be shown to be both groundless and pointless.” *Philippi. Gl. Lehre* IV. pt. 2, p. 167. In view of the direct and clear testimony of Scripture as to the fact of the atonement by

substitution, it is amusingly sad to see "Progressive Orthodoxy" come along and puffed up, because it takes the old Socinian song to be its own and new, with the noise of it again to disturb the peace of the Church as it raises the cry: "Vicarious sacrifice? imputation of guilt? transfer of righteousness? It cannot be! it is contrary to every known law, to reason, to the moral consciousness! the unbiased conscience rejects it, it is no longer believed!" To us it seems that he who places himself on such a foundation is really without hope and without God in this present world.

In its ungodly endeavor to beguile the Church of its dearest treasure, what does the New Theology propose to put in its stead? Knowing what are its negations, *what is its position?* This, by its own admission, it is hard to tell. "The Church even now waits (*sic!*) for a doctrinal statement which shall be comprehensive, satisfactory, and, at the same time free from ethical objections and from inconsistencies." *And. Rev.* July 1885, p. 56. That it be scriptural would seem to be a matter of indifference; and that the Church at this late day is without a satisfactory scriptural statement of the doctrine, is taken for granted. Poor Church! Howbeit, since we have given "the lines along which intelligent Christian thought is moving" we must do as best we can, to ascertain where such intelligence is going to land us. The question in controversy and as put by the New Theology itself, is: "What moral and spiritual ends are secured by the sacrificial life and death of Christ? How does God's attitude towards man change, and man's attitude towards God change, so that there is efficient power for the transformation of ethical and spiritual life as against the tendencies of moral corruption?"—The Old Theology would never so formulate the question; and the very cast of it indi-

cates beforehand the main drift of the answer. This is then attempted from a double point of view.

"One view of atonement is gained by considering the historical Christ in relation to humanity and as identified with it;" and in this view "the race of men with Christ in it is essentially different in fact, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it." Christ sustains "an organic relation to the race;" and He "has so identified Himself with humanity that its burden of suffering rested on Him, and every man was within the reach of sympathy." "Humanity may thus be thought of as offering something to God of eminent value. When Christ suffers, the race suffers. When Christ is sorrowful, the race is sorrowful." "The race may be conceived as approaching God, and signifying its penitence by pointing to Christ, and by giving expression in Him to repentance which no words could utter. Thus we can regard Him as our substitute; not because He stands apart, not because He is one and the race another, but because He is so intimately identified with us, and because in essential respects the life of every one is, or may be, locked in with His." "He is offered for our sins, in our stead, for our sakes. He is a propitiation to God. These expressions *symbolize* (*sic!*) a real truth, because Christ was made in all respects like unto His brethren. But Christ's power to represent or to be substituted for man is always to be associated with man's power to repent." "The power of repentance"—under appropriate influences—"remains, and to this power the gospel addresses itself. Christ suffering and sympathizing with men is able to awaken in them and express for them a real repentance. It is to this power that Christ, the holy and the merciful, attaches Himself. Realizing it in some, and being able to realize it in all,

He represents humanity before God." "If man unaided could become truly repentant, he would become holy, and would be the child of God." "But it is only in Christ that he has such knowledge of God and of himself as is necessary to a repentance which is revolutionary. It is not true, we admit and insist, that repentance without Christ is availing for redemption, for man of himself cannot repent; but on the other hand, it is not true that Christ's atonement has value without repentance. Christ's sacrifice avails with God because it is adapted to bring man to repentance. This gives it ethical meaning and value." "The race with Christ in it is substituted for the race without Christ in it. This Christ in with the race is regarded by God as one who has those powers of instruction, sympathy, purity, which can be imparted to His brethren."

From the other point of view we have given the following: "The punishment and consequences of sin make real God's abhorrence of sin, and the righteousness of law. The sufferings and death of His only Son also realize God's hatred of sin, and the righteous authority of the law; therefore punishment need not be exacted." However "it is not clear how the sufferings and death of Christ can be substituted for the punishment of sin; how, because Christ made vivid the wickedness of sin and the righteousness of God, man is therefore any the less exposed to the consequences of sin." Answer: "The punishment of sin does not save men. It only vindicates God and His law. Christ, while declaring God's righteousness, reveals God seeking men, and energizing in Christ to bring them to Himself; that really the wrath of God is only a manifestation of the love of God, since God cannot allow the sinner to be blessed in his sin. The very fact, that God's Son can-

not be among men for their redemption except at the cost of suffering from the sin of man and of dying at their hands, shows both the intrinsic badness of sin and the undiscouraged love of God to sinners." *And. Rev.* 1885, Editorial of July No.

Thetically stated, the new (?) doctrine of atonement (?) reduces itself to the following propositions:

1. The historical Christ is identified with humanity, sustains an organic relation to the human race, so that the life of every man is, or may be, locked in with His.
2. The race with Christ in it is essentially and in fact different, and therefore in the sight of God, from the same race without Christ in it.
3. Humanities burden of suffering rested on Him so that the race in Him approaching God and pointing to Him signifies its penitence, thus expressing a repentance which words cannot utter.
4. The sufferings and death of Christ serve to realize and make vivid God's hatred of sin and the righteous authority of law; therefore punishment need not be exacted of men.
5. Christ's power to represent is always to be associated with man's power to repent under the influences of Christ's "atonement;" and this "atonement" has no value without repentance.
6. Christ's "sacrifice" avails with God, because it is adapted to bring man to repentance; and His suffering, because it discloses God's righteousness, reveals God as seeking man, that is, manifests His love and thus energizes in Christ to bring man unto Himself.

From the first proposition it can be seen how the modern incarnation theory is made to do service in the doctrine

of atonement. As pointed out in our last paper, the uniqueness, the universality, the representative and sovereign character of the Godman are urged beyond all proper bounds. The Son of Man *als der Universalmensch* is made the fundamental, central and all-controlling factor as in Christology so in soteriology; and no room is found in it for the Christ either as the High-Priest who has made sin for us or as the Lamb that was slain to expiate our guilt. The Son of Man and humanity, sinful humanity, are so identified as to constitute some kind of organic whole, of which the former is the head, the latter the body, and locked in with the life of it is the life of the individual. "Christ is an individual, but an individual vitally related to every human being. He preferred to be called the Son of Man. Paul sees in Him the Head of humanity, the second Adam." But all this is nothing more than the sheerest speculation. A speculation, because the Bible furnishes no foundation for it. That the Son of God as the *causa medians et finalis* of creation is the immediate Lord of the universe—Col. 1, 16—and that this sovereignty is not made void by His incarnation, the Bible teaches us; so also, that the Godman is the Head of His body, the Church—Eph. 1, 22; 4, 15; 5, 23, and Col. 1, 18. But that the Son of Man is the Head of humanity is nowhere stated, not even in 1 Cor. 11, 23, where the context plainly shows that the *Christian* man is meant. So too is the analogy of the first and second Adam wholly irrelevant here; for the Scriptures nowhere intimate that as creatures we were for the first time enclosed in the loins of Adam so we, as creatures, are for the second time locked up in Christ. In the sphere of nature and of sin, Adam is the progenitor of our race, and the only one; whereas in the sphere of grace and holiness its progenitor is the Godman,

and He alone. It is strange, indeed, that the New Theology which on the one hand finds Him, who was made partaker of our flesh and blood, to be so far removed from us and separate from sinners that He cannot agreeably to reason and the moral consciousness be our Substitute thus to pay the penalty of our sins, on the other hand so identifies the two that the sinless Godman is made the organic head of sinful humanity! Is this, perhaps, an example of the consistency aimed at in the new doctrine?

With the first both the second and third propositions virtually fall to the ground. As regards the second so much is true, though it does not express it, that the incarnation of the Son and His presence among men is the *conditio sine qua non*, not that the race merely on account of it is already, but that it may *become* essentially and in fact different from what it is; and then, that God, in view of what Christ accomplishes for the race, deals with it differently than otherwise He could. In and with the person of Christ itself the communion of God with man is indeed established; but the re-establishment of the communion of God with humanity can be and is effected only by the work of Christ for and in men. Then, when in the third proposition we are assured that the race repents and suffers in Christ, we notice that the objective acts of atonement and justification are ingeniously smuggled over from the province of jurisprudence, where they belong, to that of medicine. The organism composed of Christ the Head and humanity the body, is diseased in the latter part and suffers pain; and the Head on account of its organic connection with the diseased part suffers with it, though in itself it is perfectly whole; the only question then is whether the part of the organism whole can heal the part of it that is sick. We admit that there is beauty in

the conception; and there would be a great deal of truth in it too if it were transferred to Christ the Head and His body the Church. As it is, it is all a deception; and its beauty makes it all the more dangerous. It utterly ignores the stern demands of divine justice; or if it thinks that repentance which words cannot utter can satisfy those demands, it is much mistaken. And besides that, it fails to explain how the organic connection of the sinless Head and the sinful body is mediated and brought about; yea, the necessity of this mediation is denied, and that is the chief objection to the New Theology.

Never can the communion of God with humanity be re-established by the work of Christ as that work is understood by the New Theology. According to the fourth proposition Jesus' sufferings and death with respect to God serve only to make vivid His hatred of sin and the righteous authority of law. In other words: the holy God did not require the life and death of His Son our Savior to pay the penalty of our guilt, but only to manifest His holiness. Christ did not suffer death in our stead thus to liquidate our debt, but "it was borne because it lay in the path of redemption." His death, as a German theologian would have it, was simply a "*Widerfahrniss*"; a something that came to Him the same way as do sufferings and death come to godly men for righteousness' sake. The holy Jesus cannot pass through this world on His mission of love without persecution and persecution unto death: behold how very wicked sin is, and how righteous that God who has sin to work itself out in such consequences! In a word, Christ was a martyr to His calling, nothing more; but, being the God-man, His martyrdom is to be prized more highly than that of others. In putting to death the Son of God, the supreme

wickedness of sin is disclosed as it is and could be in no other way. The modern view of Christ's passion therefore makes the secondary significance of it the first and only one. What is really Moses' office, and therefore foreign to Christ, is made the proper office of the latter. The whole work of Christ is so interpreted as to have nothing to do with that law which convicts and damns us whom He has come to save. There is not a thought of any substitutionary satisfaction of the law; God's righteousness having displayed itself sufficiently in the sufferings of His Son, which sufferings came to Him in His way through life, there is no need that that righteousness reveal itself any farther by punishments inflicted upon us.

Though the penal, vicarious and expiatory character of Jesus' sufferings and death are thus entirely ignored, it would nevertheless appear that God after all requires them for His own sake too; but it only appears so; for in the fifth proposition it is expressly stated that Christ's "atonement" has no value without repentance. In the event then that no man repented, God's hatred of sin and righteous authority of law were not even made vivid; that is, the life and death of Christ as such and by themselves have no value—man's repentance gives them value. The fact is, there seems to be nothing objective and of an objective value about the whole work of Christ from beginning to end. As the person of Christ is throughout inseparably bound together with humanity, so are the doings of the one so merged and confounded with the doings of the other, that those are not and amount to nothing without these. A horrible doctrine! And whether we will or not, we can not suppress the suspicion that a muddled pantheism underlies the entire theology.

That a denial of the objective value of Christ's sufferings and death is really intended is then farther brought out by the sixth proposition, which declares that His sacrifice avails with God "because it is adapted to bring man to repentance." Could "man unaided become truly repentant, he would become holy and a child of God." All the value, then, which Jesus' work has is this, that, by revealing God as the God of pardoning love and saving righteousness—and other righteousness they know not—as He did by a martyr's life, all men can be, and some are, moved to repentance. To repentance "radical" and "revolutionary," "superior to the necessities of past wrong-doing and of present habit;" in short, a repentance which sets everything right, is all-satisfactory to God, and cleansing and saving to man. "The large truth of atonement, however illustrated, and from whatever side approached, is that *except for Christ* God could only punish sinners by withdrawing Himself more and more from them; that in Christ their repentance and renewal become possible and God can bring them to their true destination."

Old pantheistic mysticism is thus revived, and called "progressive orthodoxy." To be just before God and be saved, the principle, that is, the possibility and liability to sin and die, latent in mankind, need but be eradicated. This to do, Christ has come; but no, not has He come to do just this, for sin or no sin, He would have come all the same. He did it, so to say, on His way through earth to heaven, and because it was an obstacle to Him. The principle of atonement is thus converted into a principle wholly and solely of sanctification. Every term expressive of anything objective in the work of redemption, is robbed of its true and accepted meaning. *Schleiermacher*, who is beyond

all doubt the father of this movement, has somewhere said : Yes, Christ has done enough ; done enough in this that He established an economy of salvation—*Heilsgemeinschaft*—by drawing men to Himself. Beyond this, as far as we can see, the New Theology has to this day made little progress. If the lines along which intelligent Christian thought, as it calls itself, has been moving thus far truly indicate what will be the doctrinal statement of atonement, for which the Church is falsely said to be waiting, then may God protect us from any such statement, “comprehensive, satisfactory, free from ethical objections and inconsistencies” though it may be.

C. H. L. S.

THE UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.

“If you have never given the subject attention you may think the union of Church and State in this country an impossibility ; but there is already in our land a large and rapidly-growing association known as the ‘National Reform Party,’ which, to use their own language, has for its object the establishment ‘of all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land.’ This will as they themselves admit, require such changes in the National Constitution as will allow Congress to make laws for the establishment of religion, which the First Amendment now forbids it to do. This can but result in the virtual union of Church and State, and must ultimately destroy the religious liberty which American citizens have so long enjoyed.—There are influential periodicals in many of our towns and cities which favor this amendment, besides

its leading organs, the 'Christian Statesman,' of Philadelphia, and the 'Christian Nation,' of New York, which are entirely devoted to the work."

So we read in a circular sent us by a representative of the "American Sentinel," a journal published at Oakland, California (1059 Castro St.,) opposing the "National Reform" movement, and advocating the true principles of both civil and religious liberty. And we must confess that the first clause of the first sentence of this circular was applicable to us when we read it. We did not think that there was any imminent danger of a union of Church and State in our country; and this because we did not know anything definite about the "National Reform Party." Nor do we seem to have been the only one who in regard to this lived in "blissful ignorance." Even Prof. Schuette, in his excellent book, "The State, the Church, and the School," states that concerning that party, "conceived in Xenia, O., Feb. 3, 1863, and born in Allegheny City, Pa., Jan. 27, 1864," "whether living or dead we know not," (p. 196): It is further stated there that they "disavow all intentions and desires of any union between Church and State, but they want God named and acknowledged in the Constitution and, if we mistake not, Christianity generally recognized as the religion of the land. And this, they expressly declare, not as a matter of 'compliment, but as a fact and a necessity.'"

From the circular mentioned and from the issues of the "American Sentinel" that were sent us we learn that the "National Reform Party" is not dead, but living, and actively engaged in furthering its object. From the "American Sentinel" we also see more distinctly what its object and its views are. Let us look at them a little.

The "Constitution of the National Reform Association" reads as follows:

"Believing that Almighty God is the source of all power and authority in civil government, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations, and that the revealed Will of God is of Supreme authority in civil affairs;

"Remembering that this country was settled by Christian men, with Christian ends in view, and that they gave a distinctly Christian character to the institutions which they established;

"Perceiving the subtle and persevering attempts which are made to prohibit the reading of the Bible in our Public Schools, to overthrow our Sabbath Laws, to corrupt the Family, to abolish the Oath, Prayer in our National and State Legislatures, Days of Fasting and Thanksgiving and other Christian features of our institutions, and so to divorce the American Government from all connection with the Christian religion;

"Viewing with great apprehension the corruptness of our politics, the legal sanction of the Liquor Traffic, and the disregard of moral and religious character in those who are exalted to high places in the nation;

"Believing that a written Constitution ought to contain explicit evidences of the Christian character and purpose of the nation which frames it, and perceiving that the silence of the Constitution of the United States in this respect is used as an argument against all that is Christian in the usage and administration of our Government;

"We, citizens of the United States, do associate ourselves under the following Articles, and pledge ourselves to God, and to one another, to labor, through wise and lawful means, for the ends herein set forth:

ARTICLE I.

"This Society shall be called the 'National Reform Association.'"

ARTICLE II.

"The object of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as affected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land."

How this Constitution is understood and interpreted by the leaders of the party we see from the following expressions cited by the *American Sentinel*:

"Constitutional laws punish for false money, weights, and measures, and, of course, Congress establishes a standard for money, weight and measure. So Congress must establish a standard religion or admit anything called religion." So Professor *Blanchard* in a speech made in the National Reform Convention held in Pittsburg, in 1874. Of course, he adopts the former alternative as the true one.

"The American people must say that the Bible is the word of God, and that Christianity is the religion of this country."—*President Brunot*, on the same occasion.

"According to the Scriptures, the State and its sphere exist for the sake of and to serve the interests of the Church."

“The expenses of the Church in carrying on her aggressive work it meets in whole or in part out of the public treasury.” “It is the duty of the State, as such, to enter into alliance with the Church of Christ, and to profess, adhere to, defend, and maintain, the true religion.”—*Rev. J. M. Foster*, in the *Christian Statesman*, one of the leading organs of the party, in 1884.

“If our nation will accept God as the source of all authority, Christ Jesus as the nation’s King, and His law as of supreme authority over them, its creed is orthodox.”—*Rev. J. C. K. Milligan* in the *Statesman* of March 21, 1884.

“When our Master comes into His kingdom in our beloved land, they will be candidates for the foremost positions, and scramble with the mother of Sebedee’s children for the right or left hand places in the kingdom.”—*Dr. Browne*, in the Pittsburg Convention, in 1874.

“And this religion, as understood by Protestants, tending, by its effects, to make every man submitting to its influence a better husband, parent, child, neighbor, citizen, and magistrate, was by the people (of Massachusetts) established as a fundamental and essential part of their constitution; and ought, we claim, to be likewise established by the people of the United States, as a fundamental and essential part of their constitution.”—*Hon. Mr. Patterson*, in a speech made on the same occasion.

“Of course, a Government organized on a basis embracing Christianity, would not, with propriety, invest those with office who are hostile to its characteristic faith. And none of this class have any right to claim that they shall be equally eligible to office with those who are *bona fide* citizens.”—The *Christian Nation*, another leading organ, of September 15, 1886.

This, if Hon. Mr. Patterson's view is the correct one, would necessarily exclude all Roman Catholics from office. But before these Reformers go so far they would like to have the Catholics assist them in adopting the Constitutional Amendment that speaks only of Christian religion in general and does not exclude the Catholics from any rights of citizenship. For the *Christian Statesman* has repeatedly stated its desire to join hands with them in carrying out the work of National Reform. So yet in the issue of December 11, 1884. In the *Statesman* of August 31, 1881, *Rev. Sylvester F. Scovel* says:

"We may be subjected to some rebuffs in our first proffers, and the time has not yet come when the Roman Church will consent to strike hands with other churches, as such; but the time has come to make repeated advances, and gladly to accept co-operation in any form in which they may be willing to accept it. It is one of the necessities of the situation."

This strikes us as being neither a Protestant nor a Christian way of proceeding; it savors rather of the wily tricks of a smart politician. But the *Statesman* is certainly mistaken when it thinks that the Roman Church will suffer itself to be used in such a way. It is smarter than all the members of the National Reform Party combined, and will only "strike hands" if it sees that in the end it, and not Protestantism, will be the gainer by the "reform."

"How is the amendment to be carried out practically? A majority must decide."—*Statesman*, February 21, 1884.

"This Amendment of the Constitution means that a majority of the people of this land shall first believe the principles we seek to have embodied there; and so believe

them that their views shall crystallize into the form of law, and that in its most potent form.”—*Id.*, December 20, 1883.

“So long as Christians are in the majority, they have a right to maintain a Christian character in their Government.”—*Id.*, November 1, 1883.

“If the opponents of the Bible do not like our Government and its Christian features, let them go to some wild, desolate land, and, in the name of the devil, and for the sake of the devil, subdue and set up a Government of their own on infidel and atheistic ideas, and then if they can stand it, stay there till they die.” *Rev. E. B. Graham*, a Vice-president of the Association cited “*American Sentinel*,” 1887, p. 5.

“Whether the Constitution will be set right on the question of the moral supremacy of God’s law in Government without a bloody revolution, will depend entirely on the strength and resistance of the forces of anti-christ.” *Rev. M. A. Gault*, “one of the leading lights of the National Reform Association.”.—*Ib.*

From these citations it can be clearly seen what the views and ultimate ends of the leaders of the National Reform Party are. And we do not believe that upon the whole our readers need be shown the fundamental errors and the dangerous consequences of the position that party takes. Moreover we have a book, published in our midst, that treats of all this in a far more complete and satisfactory manner than we could do in one or two *Magazine* articles. We refer, of course, to the book already mentioned in the beginning of this article, Prof. Schuette’s *The State, the Church, and the School*; and we would earnestly advise all our readers to possess themselves of a copy. As much as we know it is the best book extant on these important subjects. The under-

lying principles of every section and page of the book are the genuine Biblical ones; and the reader will very seldom be inclined to disagree with the application of these principles.

But also the *American Sentinel* battles manfully and from a correct principle and standpoint against this pretended "reform" of the Constitution and the Government of our country; a "reform" that, if carried out, would inevitably be the end of that liberty of conscience and religion which is the greatest blessing of our country. We cannot refrain from giving some of its well taken points.

"To place the laws, institutions, and usages of Christianity on a legal basis is to make them matters of legal enforcement. And as no law can exist or be enforced without a penalty, so Christianity, or what they may be pleased to recognize as Christianity, would then be enforced by civil penalties. Anything less than this would not place the laws of Christianity on a legal basis in the law of the land.—A person can be convicted of a misdemeanor only before a court of justice, and the court is necessarily constituted the judge or exponent of the law. And, therefore, under the proposed Religious Amendment, the court would have to decide what is or what is not Christian law, institution, or usage.—There are many different forms of religion in the land; and inasmuch as all creeds and faiths cannot possibly be embraced in the same legal enactment, it will become the duty of the law-makers to decide which shall be enforced as the true religion! It then needs no extended argument to show that *somebody's religious rights* will be trampled underfoot. And it would not make any difference how small the minority whose consciences were ignored, and who were made to conform to *somebody else's religion* which themselves did not

believe, it would still be *religious oppression*, and a subversion of the dearest principles of our Government.—Not only religionists, but non-religionists have rights. Not only will minorities in religion be compelled to observe religious usages which they do not believe, but non-religionists will also be compelled to observe ‘Christian laws, institutions, and usages,’ without any religious conviction whatever. These model ‘Reformers’ do not pretend that they can make men Christians by legal enactment; they only intend to compel them by law *to act as if they were Christians!*—Under the proposed Amendment, and in such a Government as they contemplate, only professed Christians can be eligible to office. They have already announced that in their system of Government every consistent infidel will be disfranchised, and Christians alone, or they who conform to Christian usages, can be permitted to hold office. It needs no great insight into politics and human nature to foresee that every persistent office-seeker will then become a member of the church—the most popular one, of course—as the surest stepping-stone to office. And in this manner our model Reformers propose to turn our republic into the kingdom of Christ.—The National Reformers profess the intention to retain the republican features of our Government; the officers will be elected by the majority, and the administration of the Government will be shaped according to the will of the majority. But the will of the majority is constantly changing, as parties rise and fall. As there are now party politics, so then there will be party religions. To suppose otherwise is to suppose that human nature is suddenly to be entirely transformed. The majority, wherever that majority may be found, will always have it in their power to determine *what religion* shall be enforced at any given

time. And *the religion of the nation will be put in the market at every general election.* Religious questions will then be canvassed, not only in the churches, and in the civil courts, but on the stumps, on the streets, and in the saloons. Candidates will be put up on this and that religious issue. And what would be the consequence? Religion itself would become contemptible in the eyes of the masses, and a reaction would take place, fatal to the cause of Christianity in our country; or else a *religious tribunal of last resort* would be demanded—a second papal system, modeled after that of Rome." *American Sentinel*, 1887, p. 2.

That politics cannot be purified, as the Reformers claim, by a union of Church and State, is clearly shown by history. The first settlers of the New England States had such a union; and what was the outcome? "The union of Church and State was fast corrupting both: it mingled base ambition with the former; it gave a false direction to the legislation of the latter." That is the well-founded judgment of Bancroft in his "History of the United States." And how could it be otherwise? Can the blessing of God rest upon a union that is wholly and entirely opposed to His will and ordination? "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's; and unto God the things that are God's," says our Savior, Matt. 22, 21. Conscience and religion are God's domain; no one else has the slightest authority there. Well does Macaulay say: "The Protestant"—and Bible—"doctrine touching the right of private judgment, is not that opposite doctrines may both be true; but it is that there is on the face of the earth no visible body to whose decrees men are bound to submit their private judgment on points of faith." If they do this, they do not render unto God the things that are God's, but render them unto Caesar, that is

unto the authority of men. Caesar, or the State, has not the office to make men Christians or to bring them into heaven. That is the office and duty of the Church, as far as men can be said to do it. Caesar, or the State, has only the office and duty to see to the bodily, external welfare of man, to preserve order and peace among men. And it has its hands full in doing this, and is even not always able to accomplish it. Let us not imagine ourselves wiser than God Himself. "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," Mark 10, 9. And what He wants to remain asunder, let not man join. The consequences and results will be ruinous in both cases. When we compare the condition of the Church for example in Germany and that in our own country we must all thank God that we are not cursed with a union of Church and State. Let us do all we can by the grace of God to remain free from it.

ST.

THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE LIGHT OF THE NEW.

Translated from the German of Professor R. Kuebel, of Tuebingen,
by G. H. S.

The object of the present article is to examine into the teachings of the New Testament with reference to the Old, especially on the subjects pertaining to the Pentateuchal problem. We will first of all objectively produce the data of the New Testament, which can give us an answer to the question, what position the writers of the New Testament books would take over or against the negative view of Prof. Wellhausen and others, and how those who strive to con-

form their views to those of the New Testament must stand in this matter. In doing this we presuppose that the readers are acquainted with the outlines of this school of Old Testament critics.* We must especially remember in this connection, that this school of critics claim to reach conclusions, not only in regard to formal and literary problems, but also in regard to matters pertaining to the substance of doctrine, which are as a rule the exact opposite of what Bible believers have all along accepted. Among these conclusions are the following: Moses did not write the Pentateuch; these books are rather the result of a long formative process going on through hundreds of years, which was not concluded until the period of the exile, or shortly after this, when the Levitical system of laws, as recorded in the Book of Leviticus, were added; then secondly, that the central idea of the Pentateuch, namely' that a theocracy was established in the Mosaic age, is an entirely unhistorical invention of the later days, when the hierarchy ruled supreme in Israel; then, further, that a Mosaic theocracy, the ark of covenant, and all the features of old worship, never existed in Israel, and that the cultus is really a feature adopted by the Israelites from neighboring peoples. It is certain that the two sides of Biblical criticism, the formal, literary on the one, and the material, essential on the other, cannot be separated. It is accordingly a correct consequence that he who adopts these so-called advanced views in regard to the literal side of the question must, in proportion as he does this, sacrifice also the contents with the vessels of truth. What does the New Testament say in this regard? This is our first question. The second will then be this: What

* For particulars see article of the translator in June number, 1886, of the COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

results follow from these data for the Christian and the theologian?

Of the statements of the New Testament concerning the Old, we will cite only those that are of special importance as indicative of the position of the former in regard to the Pentateuch. Here come into consideration first of all those innumerable passages in which the Old Testament as a whole is mentioned and treated in a manner which shows, that it is considered by the speaker as the only and absolutely unique divine source of truth, and the norm of faith, doctrine, and life. The substantives "Scripture," "Scriptures," and the citation formulas "it is written," "it is said," etc., are found hundreds of times and are used in the absolute sense, i. e., in such a manner that even when no particular book is mentioned, every one can know that only that one certain book is meant, and this in such a way, that an evidence from this one is considered as settling the matter. Over against the citation from the Old Testament the New accepts no higher court of appeal. The questions as to the relations existing between the Old Testament canon as cited by the New Testament and this same canon as we have it now; as also of the peculiarities of the readings of the text, which are generally cited from the Septuagint, to the Hebrew, can be left out of consideration here. For even if in any particular case we should come to the conclusion that the text as we now have it is not in every point identical with that of the New Testament authors, yet this would not affect the problems as a whole, and we can confidently maintain, that we have it in its entire essence the same as it was in those days. Beside the formal designation of the entire Old Testament or *γραφή*, we have the material division into the three parts of *νόμος*, or law, *προφῆται*, or prophets,

and $\phi\acute{a}\lambda\mu\omega\iota$ only in Luke 24, 44, but very often the designation "law and prophets"; so that the third division, or the Hagiographa, is not to be thought to be excluded, particularly as passages from these books are cited sometimes as "law" (John 10, 34.), sometimes as "prophets" (Acts 2, 30.). Such a combination of law and prophets we find in Matt. 5, 17; 7, 12; 11, 13; 22, 40; Luke 16, 16. 29. 31; 24, 27; John 1, 45; Acts 24, 14; 26, 22; 28, 23; Rom. 3, 21. And that the fact that these names are assigned to the Old Testament is to say that it has a peculiar divine authority, is self-evident; nor do we need to examine whence this arose. But the character of this authority is evident from two points, namely, first, in this that the New claims to be the fulfillment of the Old; and, secondly, in this, that the New proves its own character as the truth from the Old. In regard to the first point, the following passages from the three Synoptic gospels here apply, namely Matt. 5, 17. sqq. compared with Luke 16, 17; Matt. 11, 13; Luke 1, 68. 70. sqq.; Luke 24, 25. sqq. 44. Let us examine these well-known passages with special reference to the object in view of determining whether they can be reconciled to a theory which teaches that much of what is found in the Old Testament is a deception practiced by the priests, or the invention of imagination, or a fable or myth, or in general something which can in no wise be considered as divine as the New Testament men considered this all to be. That we must here decline to have anything to do with that destructive criticism of the New Testament which comes to the aid of destructive criticism of the Old by denying the authority of Christ's words on this matter, and so forth, need scarcely be stated. Here also the actual state of affairs is such, that even if criticism does here and there affix an interrogation,

the matter as a whole does not change, and it is settled that the New Testament expressly claims to be the fulfillment of the Old, and the conclusion is inevitable, that if the Old Testament is of doubtful authority, then the New has a still poorer foundation.

The strongest passage against the critics is undoubtedly Matt. 5, 17. sqq. In John the leading passage is 5, 39., where the verb "search" must be taken in the imperative, and the words "ye think," are indeed intended to express the idea that this belief is one without foundation, but not in the sense, that objectively, according to Christ's opinion, eternal life is not to be found in the Scriptures, but only in so far as "ye," i. e. the Jews, who do not believe in Christ, think to find this life in the Scriptures without Him. This they will be able to find in them only then when they search them in such a manner as to find that "they testify of me." The last sentence clearly shows that with the words "ye think," Christ did not desire to deny this objectively of the Scriptures. In this way this passage contains a most important testimony for the value of the Old Testament. When Christ says of a book, that it as a whole testifies of Him, and that in it or through it, we can find eternal life, then such a book has a value entirely unique, and we must say it has a divine value, something that Christ would not have attributed to it, if it contained, especially in those parts in which it speaks of God and His deeds, falsehoods of any kinds. The attempt has been made to break the force of such inevitable conclusions by the statement that among the Jews and the Oriental nations in general, the idea of truth, or rather the qualities considered as inhering in what was to be termed true or divine, was different from what it is among us. But it must be conceded, that when the real kernel of a book or

that which the book makes its chief substance as law or historical revelation, and not the literary or even historical secondary matter, is under consideration, then certainly the men of the New Testament would most energetically have protested against the view, that the chief contents of these books are false, e. g. such points as that God revealed the law through Moses, or the actual existence of Messianic predictions, and that only beneath such falsehoods are to be found a subjective religious kernel of truth. What has been said agrees also with the passages of the Acts, namely 3, 18. 21. 24; 24, 14; 26, 22; 28, 23. The New Testament times are declared to be the time of the fulfillment of all that God had spoken from the beginning through the prophets. That Peter in Acts 3, 21. did not mean to say this with the mental reservation, that this or that which is mentioned in the Old Testament as revelation, is not really such, but that both he and the Author of the Acts were thinking of the Old Testament in general, in which case the general term "prophets" could embrace also David's psalms and especially Moses, cannot be denied. From the letters of Paul we cite the following passages treating of the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Old, namely Rom. 1, 2; 1 Cor. 15, 3. sqq.; 2 Cor. 1, 20; Tit. 1, 2. Why it is, that it was chiefly the Romans, Corinthians and Galatians who had reasons to consider the subject of the relation of the Old to the New Testament, as is evident from these and other passages, we need not investigate here. But we feel sure that the well-known character and purpose of these letters explain this sufficiently, so that the comparative silence of the other Pauline letters on the subject of the Old Testament cannot be used against the authenticity of the letters nor to prove that Paul had later changed his views

concerning the authority of the Old Testament. But already in Romans 1, 2. the words "by His prophets in Holy Scripture," no matter how we may explain the absence of the article before the word "Scripture," and 1 Cor. 15, 3. sqq. prove that Paul also considered the Old Testament as the Scripture, whose centre and kernel were the prophecies concerning Christ, which were fulfilled in Him. And to take out from among these "Scriptures" single points, and to say that in the rubbish of foolish fables, myths, or stories of this or that book is also to be found here and there a golden kernel of genuine religious truth or revelation (this last word understood in the sense of modern "advanced" theology) can certainly not be harmonized with Paul's words. Of 2 Tim. 3, 15. sqq. we will speak later. That the non-Pauline letters and Revelation take the same position concerning the Old Testament does not require any proof. Concerning the Epistle to the Hebrews, whose introductory words 1, 1. sqq. already speak of this, we will treat later. "Scripture" is mentioned James 2, 8; 4, 5; "Scriptures" in 2 Pet. 3, 16. But its meaning is disputed. Only the Joannine Epistles, with the exception of an historical passage to be treated farther on, do not give an expression to the views of their author on the connection existing between the Old and the New Testament. All other New Testament writings contain such passages, as teach that the New Testament is fulfillment of the Old, as we shall see.

As a second proposition we maintain, that all the New Testament writers prove the truth of what they teach as New Testament doctrine by showing that it agrees with the Old Testament. The proof of this is found in part in those many passages, in which a proposition is maintained as correct, a deed as right, a history as necessary, by citing from the

Old Testament or an incident mentioned by the Old Testament; in part, and even more, in those passages, where indirectly and as it were unintentionally the teachings of the New Testament are saturated with references to thoughts of the Old. Among the passages to be mentioned in this connection, in addition to John 5, 39, already spoken of, probably Acts 17, 11, is to be placed at the head. In this passage the examination of the teachings of Paul, or of the New Testament in general, is done by "examining the Scriptures daily whether these things be so," for which those of Berea are praised. The meaning of the author is manifestly this, that the New Testament should be tested by the Old, and that the outcome of such an examination would be the knowledge of the truth of the New by finding that it agreed with the Old. And this is the view of the whole New Testament.

From the words of Christ we will quote here only how in Matt. 12, 1 sqq. and then in parallel passages, he justifies his actions on the Sabbath day by citing 1 Sam. 21, and Numb. 28, 9, and how in Matt. 22, 23, sqq., he adduces his proof for the resurrection from Ex. 3, 6; for the superiority of the Messiah over David, Matt. 22, 41 sqq. from Psalm 110, and finally that repeated δεῖ in reference to the most important feature of His work, namely His death, which δεῖ is based upon the fact that "Scriptures" were thereby to be fulfilled. The fact that the suffering of the Savior, (something that was so offensive to the Jews) was a divine necessity and the doctrine concerning it was divine truth, is proved by this, that it is taught in the Old Testament. The central truth of the New Testament in this way has its essential foundation in the Old. If we take away this foundation, what will be left of the superstructure? And as Christ

taught, thus also did the apostles. According to Matt. 2, 4 sqq. Christ was to be born in Bethlehem because Micha 5 must be fulfilled. Cf. 21, 4 sq. As to Paul's position we can refer to Rom. 4, where beyond all doubt his doctrine of justification is proved from the Old Testament; or to Rom. 9, 11, where not only his leading propositions are based upon the Old Testament, but where also that indirect interlarding of Old Testament ideas and thoughts in the New, of which we spoke above, is especially clear. Cf. also 1 Cor. 15, 3 sqq. In a similar manner as the doctrine of justification is proved from the Old Testament in Rom. 4, it is done also in Gal. 3. The doctrine of atonement as taught by Paul stands upon an Old Testament foundation, e. g. Christ is the Pascal Lamb, 1 Cor. 5, 7, and the many references of Paul and Peter and John to Isaiah 53. As to the non-Pauline letters we need only refer to the Epistle of St. James, especially to his proof for the doctrine of justification by a reference to Gen. in C. 2, 14, sqq. of his Epistle. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the superiority of the New Testament Mediator and His work over that of the Old, is proved by promises taken from the Old Testament itself. The New Testament in this way, if the Old Testament be not the truth, becomes a tree which has no roots. Of course this is not to mean that the New Testament doctrines are true for the only reason that they are proved by the Old. So Christ, and with Him the sacred writers, know that their teachings are in themselves divine truth and divine revelation. But this divine truth and the Old Testament basis for it, stand or fall together in the minds of the New Testament writers. Both methods of proof for the truth of New Testament words in some cases stand side by side; sometimes it seems that a N. T. truth stands alone by virtue of the divine authority in Christ or His disciples

but is further corroborated by its agreement with the Old Testament. But in these cases too the idea is found, that if the Old Testament would teach otherwise than does the New Testament writer, the latter would not have the truth. For even where the abolition of the law by Christ has produced a relative difference between the two Testaments, the underlying idea is that the Old Testament declares its "end" to be in Christ, and is thus proved to be true where it has been abolished. And in all this the controlling thought is that the Old and the New Testament together are divine truth, the latter as the fulfillment and only as the fulfillment of the former.

With this we have arrived at the other important point, namely the teaching of the New Testament concerning the genesis or origin of the Old Testament, or concerning the Old Testament as the word of God. In the Gospels Old Testament citations, (omitting those from the Pentateuch which are to be discussed further on) are designated as having come "from God," "from the Holy Spirit," etc. Cf. Matt. 1, 22; 23, 43; Mark 12, 36; perhaps also John 10, 35. In the Acts the divine origin of Old Testament passages is taught in 1, 16; 3, 18; 2, 30; 4, 25; 13, 22 sqq.; 26, 6; 28, 25. From Paul's letters we cite Rom. 3, 2; 9, 15. 25; 10, 21, and those passages in which it is especially emphasized that which has been written in the Old Testament has been written for our instruction etc., which means, that the oracles of God were written down in the Old Testament in order to secure their effectiveness in the era of the New Testament, Cf., Rom. 4, 23, sqq.; 15, 4; 1 Cor. 10, 11. Naturally the most important passage is the *locus classicus* 2 Tim. 3, 15. sqq. No matter how the different exegetical problems of this passage may be solved, it is certain that the Old Testament in

its essence and origin is here ascribed to the divine Spirit. Even if this passage does not contain an inspiration theory, the fact of an inspiration is certainly contained in it. A nearer approach to a theory is found in the other *locus classicus*, 2 Pet. 1. 19, sqq., where in express words "moved by the Holy Ghost" is contrasted with "private interpretation," i. e. the divine origin of prophecy, in its character of Scriptures, is especially emphasized. We must notice here also the reference to the sure character of prophecy as a light that shineth in a dark place. Of further passages in non-Pauline passages we need only mention here the well-known words in 1 Pet. 1, 11, where the prophets with the Spirit of Christ are referred to not merely as speaking orally, but also as writing down their prophecy. Then we refer to the abundance of passages in the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which almost throughout the person speaking in the Old Testament is stated to be God, or Christ, or the Holy Spirit; cf. 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13; 2, 11; 3, 7; 4, 4, 7; 5, 6; 7, 21; 8, 8; 10, 30; 12, 15, and in regard to this point there is no difference between the Old Testament books, not even between the strictly prophetic, in which in the Old Testament itself God is represented as the Speaker, on the one hand, and the non-prophetic on the other. How realistic the author of this Epistle conceives the fact that it is God who speaks in the Old Testament, can best be seen from the evidence he takes from Ps. 95, 8 sq. in 3, 7 sqq. of his epistle, especially in 4, 7. The words of the Psalm are so entirely those of God, that it marks the new establishment of a day of rest, of a period for the entrance upon the Sabbath-rest on the part of God, over against Num. 14, 21 sqq. From the other letters we will cite only James 5, 10, where the prophets are said to have spoken "in the name of the Lord."

If the contents of the Old Testament are the word of God, it is a matter of course that they are true. The Holy Scriptures cannot be broken (John 10, 35, cf. Matt. 15, 17, 18); its contents are subjects of faith, and Paul in a most comprehensive manner declares solemnly that he is serving the God of his fathers as a man who believes everything that has been written in the law and in the prophets (Acts 24, 14). Even if this important passage were to be weakened by the limitation of the words "believe," and "all," so that it were not to be taken absolutely and in an external sense, and could not be made to pronounce every single word and statement of the Old Testament infallibly certain, yet a limitation which declares to be untrue, unhistoric, an intended lie, a deception of priests, etc., any saying which the Old Testament asserts to be the word of God and which involves saving facts and doctrines—such a limitation no man of fair mind will hold to be consistent with the teachings of St. Paul and those of his way of thinking. To the passages cited which teach that the whole Old Testament as such is true (cf. also Acts 26, 27) we add those passages of the New Testament, in which (here again not yet considering the Pentateuch) certain special portions of the Old Testament are pronounced historically correct or are presupposed to be so. Here we must take into consideration especially those two chapters in the Acts which contain a repetition of the whole history of Israel, manifestly on the presupposition that all this really happened as it is recorded in the Old Testament. These two chapters contain the address of Stephan Acts 7 and that of Paul at Antiochia, Acts 13. Both of these, but especially the former, are of the greatest importance for a truly Biblical criticism of the Pentateuch. From the other Old Testament books we find quoted in chap. 7,

Joshua (v. 46), Samuel (46), Kings (47); in C. 13, v. 19, sqq. we have other matter out of these books and out of Judges. To these two chapters we must add Heb. 11, where about all the historical books of the Old Testament are cited: v. 30 f. (Joshua), 32 sqq. (Judges, Samuel, Kings). It seems that certain things out of the books of the Maccabees are here also taken as historically true. This of course does not prove that they were considered by the author as books of the same rank as the canonical writings, but only that the events quoted are true. In general we learn nothing from this passage as to what books were considered by the author as canonical or as non-canonical; and we too will take nothing out of the passage except that the events recorded in the historical books of the Old Testament, in the conviction of the author, were true. The other passages in the New Testament that belong here refer principally to individual points in the Old Testament, but beyond all doubt rest on the same idea, i. e. of the truly historical character of the accounts of the Old Testament. Cf. on the history of David, Matt. 12, 3; 22, 43; Luke 2, 4, 11; Rom. 4, 6; on Elisha and Elijah, Luke 4, 25 sqq., 9, 5, 4, Matt. 17, 3; Rom. 11, 2 sqq., James 5, 17; on Jonah, Matt. 12, 38 sqq.; 16, 4; Luke 11, 29 sqq.; on the Queen of the East, (1 King 10 sq.), Matt. 12, 42; on Job, James 5, 11; on the lot of the prophets and other men of God, Matt. 5, 12; 23, 35.

From what has been said we draw the conclusion, that the Old Testament, as a whole and in its particular features, in its doctrine and in its history, is recognized by the New as true. The New Testament men of God find in the Old Testament the Word of God, which they in all simplicity believe; they see the proof of the truth of their own teachings in the harmony of their doctrines with the Old Testa-

ment, the New Testament being the fulfillment of the history and teaching of the Old. To deprive the Old Testament revelation of its character as truth, would be to deprive the New Testament of the foundation upon which it stands.

II.

If what we have said concerning the Old Testament and its contents is applicable to any particular part in a special manner, that particular part is the Pentateuch. In genuine Israelitic manner these books are considered by the New Testament to be the most important in the Old Testament collection. The Pentateuch, in accordance with the Hebrew word Thorah, is generally called in the New Testament "the law," with or without the words "of Moses." Then sometimes the name "law" is applied to the whole Old Testament. Cf. John 10, 34; 1 Cor. 14, 21. The exalted authority, the divine origin and character of the law in the narrow sense of the word, in which case as a rule the books and their contents are taken together, is seen from the following passages of the Gospels. In Matt. 4, 4 sqq. Christ repels Satan in the temptation by passages all taken from Deuteronomy. It has been rightly said that the book of the law given in the desert especially occupied the attention of Jesus while in the desert. And here must be noticed that it was not "the religious kernel" of the passages in question, upon which Christ based His words, but He says "it is written," and thus refers to the *written* word of the Old Testament Scriptures. We have above referred to Matt. 5, 17 sqq.; Luke 24, 27. In Matt. 22, 31 the words of Ex. 3, 6 are cited as "spoken by God." All the passages yet to be mentioned, in which certain portions of the Pentateuch

are cited authoritatively, rest upon the same assumption of its divine character. In particular is the decalogue thus treated by the Gospels; cf. Matt. 5, 21 sqq.; 12, 5 sqq., 15, 4; 19, 18; Mark, 7, 13 compared with v. 10. But it is well known that in the Gospel of John the Mosaic law is called "your law," and it has been thought that this is a depreciation of the estimate put upon it. Cf. John 8, 17; 10, 34; 15, 25. The connections in which these passages stand show that there indeed lies in these passages a certain inner freedom of the speaker or writer from the law, such as results from the possession of Christian liberty; but the term "your" law does not involve the idea, that this law is only "yours" but not mine," i. e. a law which you consider divine, but which I consider the opposite, but it involves this contrast: You take it as giving you authority to judge and condemn me. But concerning the question itself as to the divine authority of this law, nothing is here said. And thus also, when in Acts 7, 53, Gal. 3, 19, Heb. 2, 2 it is said that the law was given through the agency of the angels, this is no depreciation of the law, and still less, as Ritschl imagines, a twofold opinion of the law by Paul, assigning to it in part a higher authority as God's law, and in part a lower authority as given by angels. The address of Stephen, which is the first to mention this mediation by angels, Acts 7, 38, carries with it its own explanation by saying that we are here to think chiefly of the "angels of the Lord;" and especially by saying, that these are "living words" which Moses received, and as such have a high and even divine authority. We refer here yet to Heb. 2, 2, where also the idea is found, that angels are the mediums of the law, and in which letter no one will dream of finding the doctrine taught, that the law is not of God. But this

also this letter teaches, as does the whole New Testament and Christ, that the law represents a lower, less perfect stage of revelation (Matt. 5, 21 sqq.) than does the New Testament. It is remarkable that so many of our modern theologians must be reminded of the fact, that something can be really holy, according to Rom. 7, holy, right and good, and yet it may be authority only within a certain stage. When we go to Paul, we can learn from the passage just mentioned, Rom. 7, 12 sqq. what he thought of the law. But of this passage, it may be said, that it contains nothing which proves the authority of the *book* of the law, but that it speaks of the *contents*. The latter is certainly the case, but certainly Paul did not separate the legal contents as divinely authoritative from the book containing these laws as not divinely authoritative, nor could he have rejected a large portion of this book as fable and fiction. In Rom. 3, 2 he says, that the words of God were entrusted to the Jews, and mentions in Rom. 9, 15 the passage Ex. 33, 19 as such words of God. And when in Gal. 3 he subordinates the law to prophecy, it is plain from what has been said concerning the stages of revelation, that the former is thereby not deprived of its divine character. The Apostle's idea is certainly this, that the great "schoolmaster unto Christ" has been ordained of God, and it is not "according to the promises" (v. 21). And especially are we to notice that which is mentioned in this very passage concerning the priority and superiority of the promise over against the law, rests upon the book of the law, the Pentateuch. Paul proves his thesis from the Pentateuch, especially from Gen. 15; and how high an estimate he puts upon this book, and upon its very letters, is clear from v. 16, where the singular "seed" is used as a proof that reference is here made to one, Christ. One

may call this, as also the well known passage Gal. 4, 21 sqq. "rabbinism," if one will; we are nevertheless of the conviction that if we would learn the Apostle's standpoint over against the law, we must use *all* the passages of the Apostle in a similar manner, and allow the Apostle to say what he wants. And then, since Paul does not claim authority only for a portion of what he says, and not for the rest, the Bible-believing theologians must adopt Paul's standpoint toward the Old Testament not only in so far as it may please him, but throughout. Of the non-Pauline Epistles we need scarcely mention that of James as teaching the divine authority of the law. Only we must note especially that particularly in this letter the book of the law and the laws it contains are always taken together. According to 2, 8 it is necessary to observe the royal law "according to Scripture." In reference to the Apocalypse, we should especially note, that that very prophet whom the modern critics bring into closest relation to the so-called Priest-Codex (Levitical Law) and whom Wellhausen speaks of in the most disrespectful terms, namely Ezekiel, is acknowledged to be a genuine and divine prophet. The prophecies of the Apocalypse in a great measure rest upon Ezekiel. If the latter is a dreamer, the author of Revelation is one; if, on the other hand, the latter is a great divine Apostle of the New Testament, then Ezekiel cannot be what modern criticism claims him to be.

But if the law and the book of the law are of divine origin, then the contents are the truth. Of the Pentateuch the following is testified to by the Gospels as true, namely of Abraham, Matt. 3, 9; 8, 11; John 8, 39; Luke 16, 22; of Abel, Matt. 23, 35; Sodom, Matt. 10, 15; 11, 24 and parallel passages; the brazen serpent, John 3, 14; Jacob and Joseph,

John 4, 5 ; the creation and the command of God in it, Matt. 19, 4 sqq. ; laws, Matt. 12, 5 and parallels ; 22, 24 sq. That Israel is the chosen people of God as claimed by the Pentateuch is stated by Christ in Matt. 8, 12 ; 10, 6 ; 15, 24 ; 21, 43 ; 33, 37 sqq. ; 24, 1 sqq., and especially those passages in which the transfer of the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles is announced, as also those in which the connection with the people of God is made dependent on faith, cf. Matt. 8, 9 ; John 8, 37 sqq. In the Acts we cite again chiefly the addresses in chapters 7 and 13. In the first mentioned the whole contents of Gen. and Ex. is testified to. Of especial importance it is also that the famous passage Amos 5, 25 sqq., which has so often been quoted against the historical character of the Mosaic sacrificial ordinances, is cited in Acts 7, 42 ; and in direct connection with it the ark of the Covenant is mentioned as having been made by Moses (v. 44). Stephen and the author of the Acts evidently did *not* believe that what the Lord says by Amos, to wit, that what the Jews did in the forty years, by reason of their rebellion, stands in contradiction to that which they, by virtue of the Mosaic law of God, ought to have been and done. *De facto* there was idolatry ; *de jure* worship of Jehovah was the religion of the people. And it seems evident that these two are not mutually exclusive. And in the same manner, Peter's expression in Acts 15, 10, that the law was a yoke which neither the Jews of his days nor their fathers were able to bear, is perfectly in harmony with the divine origin and character of the Mosaic law. In the Pauline letters we find the contents of the Pentateuch testified to. The whole chapter of Gal. 3 with its exposition of the law and the promises does this ; as do also all those passages in which the prerogatives of Israel are mentioned, especially Rom. 9,

11. Then, in particular, on Abraham cf. Rom. 4, 1 sqq., 18 sqq.; on the history of creation, 1 Cor. 11, 8; 15, 45; Eph. 5, 30 sq.; 1 Tim. 2, 13 sqq.; on the fall, 2 Cor. 11, 3; 1 Tim. 2, 14; Rom. 5, 12; on circumcision, Rom. 4, 9 sqq.; on Isaac, Rom. 9, 7. 10 sqq.; Pharaoh, Rom. 9, 17; Sarah and Hagar, Gal. 4, 30 sqq.; Moses' veil and shining countenance, 2 Cor. 3; Jannes and Jambres, 2 Tim. 3, 8; the journey through the desert, 1 Cor. 10, 1 sqq. In regard to the law of Moses we mention first the general passages, Rom. 2, 18 sqq.; 7, 12 sqq. cf. 1 Tim. 1, 8; Gal. 3; those passages which refer to particular data, as 1 Cor. 9, 9. 13; Col. 2, 16 sqq.; the decalogue in Rom. 2, 21 sq.; 13, 9. Eph. 6, 2. Of eminent importance in this regard is the Epistle to the Hebrews. This letter loses its whole contents and importance if the Pentateuch is not true, and especially if the ark of the Covenant and the cultus are not historical. A central idea of this letter, namely that of an upper sanctuary, rests upon Ex. 25, 40. Here it is especially clear, that it is impossible to say, that the fact of the existence of the heavenly tabernacle remains fixed even if its earthly image, the Mosaic tabernacle, never did exist. No matter what position we may take in regard to the author's whole standpoint, it is a matter beyond dispute that the N. T. or heavenly existence and the O. T. type of it stand and fall together. Of particulars in the letter to the Hebrews we mention, 3, 2 for Moses; 3, 16 for the Exodus; 4, 8 for Joshua; 5, 4 for Aaron; 6, 13 sqq. for Abraham; c. 7 for Melchisedec; 7, 5 for Levites and tithes; 7, 14 for the tribe of Judah; c. 8 for the ark and the sacrifices; c. 9 for the same; 9, 19 for the covenant offering of Ex. 24; 9, 25; 10, 1 ff. for the Day of Atonement, cf. 13, 11 sqq.; c. 11 for Abel etc. to Moses; 12, 16 sq. for Esau: 12, 17 sqq. for the legislation in Ex. 19. In

the other epistles we mention 1 Peter 3, 6 for Sarah; 3, 20 sq. for the flood; 2 Peter 2, 6 for Sodom; 2, 15 sq. for Bileam; 1 John 3, 16 for Cain; Jude 11 for Cain, Bileam, and Korah; Rev. 2, 16 for Bileam, cf. also 2, 20; 19, 6.

These special passages together with the general views of the New Testament writers on the Pentateuch will substantiate the position, that a view which considers the contents of the Pentateuch to a greater or less extent to be untrue, unhistorical, etc., is not in harmony with the position of the New Testament writers, and the same is the case in reference to the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch. In this regard it must be specially remembered that in the good majority of passages where the contents of the Pentateuch are cited, the Mosaic authorship is not specially mentioned. Generally we find in such cases the words "it is written," or "it has been written," etc. But yet the number of passages in which the book of the law is in plain words ascribed to Moses is greater than is generally supposed to be the case. More definitely the state of affairs is the following: Sometimes the word "law" is found thus, that the contents are meant, and then either the law as a whole (thus especially in the case of Paul) or a particular law, but yet not to be thought as separated from the book in which it is found, but rather as a part of this, e. g. Matt. 22, 36; 23, 23; Rom. 5, 20. and often; sometimes "law" is meant as the "law-book," e. g. Luke 10, 36. Such passages in which the contents of the Pentateuch are given with the general formula of "it is written," we can here pass by. They can be considered as having a bearing on the question of the Mosaic authorship only in so far as the speaker or writer would use them in conformity with the generally accepted belief of his times, namely that they are Mosaic. This name appears

in the passages here mentioned in a twofold way; in the one instance the point is again the law as such, whose author or medium Moses is represented to be (cf. Matt. 23, 2. sqq.; Rom 5, 14., where the question as to the authorship of the *book* is not mentioned), or, secondly (and this most frequently), more or less distinctly reference is had to the law as being found in this book, and in this way the book of the law is ascribed to Moses. In saying "less distinctly," we think of such passages as Matt. 8, 4; Luke 5, 14; Matt. 19, 7. 8; 22, 34; Mark 7, 10; Acts 3, 22. But the words "more distinctly" we refer to those passages where mention is made of the "law of Moses" in such a way, that indeed even here the leading thought is of the contents, but where it is as clear as the noon day's sun, that these are considered identical with the book, and are indeed especially declared to be such, e. g. Luke 2, 22. 23. 39; John 7, 19. 22. sqq.; Acts 6, 14; 15, 5; Heb. 10, 28. Then there are a number of passages in which explicit mention is made of the law in the sense of a book of the laws or explicitly the "book of Moses," and when there can be no doubt, that the writer ascribed the authorship of the Pentateuch to Moses. Cf. Mark 12, 26; Luke 20, 37; 24, 27; John 1, 45; 1 Cor. 9, 9; Acts 15, 21; 2 Cor. 3, 15; Rom. 10, 5. 19; Heb. 7, 14. The strongest passages are John 5, 45. sqq. and John 1, 17. The first passage we call so, because here Jesus makes use of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as an argument against the Jews, making the very point, that they must believe *Moses*, or that *Moses* condemns them, so that if Moses were not the author of the Pentateuch, the whole argument would be null and void. The second passage, however, does indeed not speak directly of the law as such, but by contrasting in general outline "that the law has been given by Moses, but

grace and truth through Jesus Christ," it passes a judgment on the contents and origin of the law, in which the words "through Moses" are as little a matter of no importance, but are just as integral a part of the position, as in the corresponding sentence concerning grace and truth the words "through Jesus Christ" are. We cannot omit the words "through Moses," we cannot say that it is a matter of indifference whether it was given through Moses or not, without undermining the whole position of the writer, both on the Old and on the New Testament; and as regards the *book* of Moses, we must again apply what has been said before, that the idea of "law given through Moses" includes also the idea of the law book. Certainly with this sentence can be harmonized only such an idea of the book of the law as adheres to its Mosaic character.

COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.

JUNE, 1887.

No. 3.

“THE NEW THEOLOGY.”

THIRD AND LAST ARTICLE.

When, as we firmly believe, in full accord with the Scriptures, the Church of the Reformation assigns to the doctrine of

JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH

the central position in the divine plan of salvation, it may be said to do so not only on account of the intrinsic truth and worth of the doctrine itself, but also on account of the no less fundamental doctrines that are both logically and historically bound up with it. Defining the modality of the sinner's justification before God to consist in the imputation to him of another's righteousness, even the righteousness of Christ, it evidently belongs to the scope of this doctrine to show the necessity of man's justification and of just this mode of it; then, its possibility and its objective realization in the person and work of Christ; moreover, the means and the manner of its subjective consummation among men; and lastly, its regenerating, sanctifying and saving effects on him who is thus justified, and the new life in which he lives and labors to the glory of Him who has justified and saved him. The subject, thus viewed in all its ramifications both backward

and forward, is seen to cover the whole order of salvation. Especially are the three cardinal doctrines of Christ and His atonement, of justification and of sanctification so immediately and vitally connected that it is impossible—unless it be by some happy inconsistency—to preserve in its integrity any one of them where either of the others is corrupted; and whereas the second is the central one in the sequence, and because it is as its objective point determined by the first, and it again determines the third, it is with good reason declared to be the *Articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* the doctrine with which the Church stands or falls.—*Form. Conc.*

The New Theology, inasmuch as it denies the sacrificial and atoning element in the work of Christ, thereby rejects *in toto* the doctrine of justification as held by the evangelical Church and, with a greater or less degree of purity, by the whole of catholic christendom. Since, according to the modern view, there are no such things as a substitutionary satisfaction of the Law and a righteousness that can be transferred, it is plain that on such a supposition the sinner's justification by the imputation to him of the justifying merits of Christ, is wholly out of the question. The New School is therefore constrained either to leave out of its system of thought the article of justification altogether, or to introduce into it one that is foreign to the Church of all times. Hence it has transpired that some at least have openly disavowed their belief not only in the reality but also in the necessity of man's justification before God. To judge, for example, from a review of *Ritchl's* doctrine of the atonement as given in the *Beweis des Glaubens*—March number of the present year—it appears that that notorious writer held sin to be a mere *ἀγνοία*, a lack simply of better knowledge, an error indeed, but without malice, and therefore

nothing culpable or subject to God's retributive displeasure. Such phenomena as the sinner's sense of guilt, remorse of conscience, dread of punishment, desire for pardon and the like, are declared to be the creations wholly of the imagination, and without real cause and foundation. The forgiveness of sin, of which the Scriptures speak so much, was by *Ritschl* considered to be an entirely subjective act, consisting in this, that man is brought to the recognition of the fact, as asserted, that God's loving attitude to the sinner has never been really disturbed. In a word: according to *Ritschl* and his followers, a man's justification takes place when he is made to believe that he, so far as God is concerned, is not and never was in need of such a thing. When in connection with such effusions *R.* appealed to *Luther* for support—as we are told he did—it would seem that in the matter of misrepresenting and defaming the great Reformer protestants can even outdo the papists.

It dare hardly be said, however, that the New Theology generally has departed from the saving truth to this alarming extent, or that it is prepared to go to such lengths on the article in question. It professes, at least, to believe both the necessity of man's justification and its realization by Christ. That it is sincere in this we have no right to doubt; but whether there is anything like substantial truth in its professions is another matter, and one that may well be called in question.

The New Theology up to this time constituting, as it does, simply a school, and not a sect with a well-defined confession of faith, it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain just what it thinks and believes as a whole; besides, it is a school of much thought and, above all, of great liberty of thinking. Of a *consensus* among its masters and pupils on

any of the more specific questions of theology—its negations of the old doctrines perhaps excepted—little or nothing is to be discovered as yet. Another difficulty in the way of ascertaining its real position presents itself in the fact that it continues to operate with the *termini technici* of the old school, fully aware as it is that it employs such terms all along in a sense altogether foreign to them. This is provokingly deceptive; and, whether intended or not, it blinds the eyes of the unwary student in a way that may well excite the suspicion of fraud. Thus it may have been observed from our review of the doctrine of the atonement, that while it pretends to accept and explain such a doctrine, it in reality and completely does away with it. And still it adheres to the name, charging it with a meaning, however, such as it never can have by any law of language or by any teaching of revealed and historic truth.

However, the immediate logical connection of the doctrines of the atonement and of justification seems to be felt among them, and with it also the necessity of bringing the one into harmony with the other. But since the New Theology men have virtually abandoned the former by depriving it of its objective reality and significance, and substituted for it some vague subjective process, that is to say, an operation (flowing from the life and death of Christ) on man for the atoning life and death of Christ in behalf of man, it necessarily follows, either, that with the former it has given away the latter doctrine, or that if it still holds to a doctrine of justification, this must be entirely different from any one founded on an objective atonement and be derived from the subjective process put in place of the atonement. And so indeed we find it.

Notwithstanding all the vagueness and the vagaries of

the new school with reference to this doctrine and the difficulties encountered in consequence, it may be said to hold fast to the two general doctrines: the one, that without the personal Christ no one can be saved; the other, that man's sins are forgiven for Christ's sake. These statements, of course, may mean a great deal, and they may mean very little; for since neither in the one nor in the other anything is said about the reasons why and the manner in which Christ is held to be necessary to salvation and available for the forgiveness of sin, it is possible that the attempts to determine these factors may so far fall short of the Gospel truth and lead into error as to annul the very doctrines to be explained. What has actually come to pass in this contingency, we shall presently see.

Teaching a forgiveness of sin, modern theology has of course a doctrine of justification; but this is by no means the doctrine taught by the Scriptures and believed by the Church. According to the latter we are accounted just before God, that is, our sins are forgiven, because Christ has in our stead and for us satisfied all the demands of the Law, He having rendered for us the obedience and suffered for us the penalty of obedience which on our part were due to God and His Law. Not so according to the view modern theology takes of it. The way this would account for the forgiveness of sins, and hence at the same time define the act, is, as near as we can come to it, something like this: With the appearance of Christ the God-man, a new life-principle has come and manifested itself among men; by faith in Him men are engrafted into Christ and become members of His body; therewith the new life-power, that is in Christ and of Him, begins to flow into the hearts of such as have entered into communion with Him, and thus becomes

operative in them to the production of the same kind of life as is in Christ; a life, *nota bene*, the same in kind, but not as yet the same in degree of perfection, for in this its latter aspect it is progressive, working on towards perfection. Then God, in view of this Christ-life in the believers, and especially in view of its final perfection in them, even now—we are told—treats such believers as already holy; that is, ignores their sins, acknowledges them as His children and as heirs of eternal life.

This theology, it will be observed, does away entirely with the Christ for us by denying the *avtī** of the Gospel altogether, and by so weakening and distorting the meaning of the Gospel's *ōπέρ** that Christ is for us only in so far as He is or would be in us; that is, so far as He by His Spirit energizes in us. The Son of God is said to have come into the world not in order of and by Himself, wholly without us and independent of us, to work out a righteousness that might then as a treasure and gift be bestowed on us as our own, and on account of which God should declare us righteous; but He has come in order by the example of His life and death, and by the influence of the Spirit setting forth that life and death, so to energize in us that we ourselves may be made righteous even as He is righteous. Except to the end that there might be some one into whom we could be engrafted and into whom the Holy Spirit might engraft us for our own sanctification and salvation, there was on our side no necessity for the incarnation of the Son. Thus is the Christ our righteousness so thoroughly merged into the Christ our sanctification, that the former is entirely lost or done away with. And men are to esteem

* See last number of this *Magazine* page 81 et seq.

themselves just before God and acceptable to Him, because, being in Christ and partaking of the Christ-life, they are in their own natures potentially righteous unto a perfect personal righteousness in the future. The hitherto prevalent conception of justification as a forensic or judicial act is declared to be all wrong, and instead of it we are now to conceive of justification as a creative process beginning, it may be, in this life—a point not settled as yet—and ending in or after death.

The obstacles which the plain teachings of the Scriptures oppose to this view may perplex its advocates, but do not hinder them from holding fast to it all the same. To them it would seem to be doubtful anyway whether the words of Scripture are the absolute truth, and that is something to begin with; add to this the revised statutes of hermeneutics in vogue among these men, and it were strange if the Scriptures could not be managed to their own satisfaction. And so when the word of God declares—Rom. 3, 21 sq.—that *apart* from the Law a righteousness of God has been made manifest, we are assured that that is a righteousness not acquired by God without us but wrought of God in us; (but if in us, then certainly does it consist in love and is it of love; but and if of love, then is it of the Law, and not apart from it, as St. Paul says it is); and when it is moreover declared that this righteousness of God is *through* faith and *unto* all them that believe, we are asked to believe that faith itself is substantially that righteousness and that, properly speaking, it is not unto men as from without, but in men as something of them, though under divine operation. When—2 Cor. 5, 21—we are assured that God has made Him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might be the righteousness of God in Him, we are advised that that means that

sin molested Christ during His mundane presence and that if we will but demean ourselves with reference to sin even as Christ did, we shall be righteous too. Again, when it is written—Rom. 4, 4 sq.—that to him that worketh, the reward is not reckoned as of grace but as of debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on Him that justifies the ungodly, his faith is reckoned for righteousness, this is interpreted to mean, that salvation by personal righteousness is by grace anyway, because it is God who through Christ creates this righteousness; and remembering that in point of fact those justified according to the modern view are only potentially righteous, and that therefore it seems somewhat strange that God Himself should account of them as already righteous even before Himself and unto the gift of eternal life, we are told, as we said before, that God here speaks and acts in anticipation of what will be. And thus, in one way or another, are the Scripture testimonies on this subject successfully, as it is thought, disposed of.

That the definition of justifying faith is shaped to suit the office assigned to it, follows as a matter of course. Love is said not to be the fruit but to constitute the very essence of the faith that justifies. The *fides formata* is thus represented to be not so much the receptive means—the *δρανόν ληπτικόν* of evangelical dogmatics—as it is the active principle or power drawing life from Christ and diffusing that life throughout the nature of the believer and then, as a new motive force, exercising him unto holiness of life. This one-sided conception of faith explains why, in the New Theology doctrine of the means of grace, such great stress is laid on the legal uses to which the life and death of Christ may be put from a certain point of view. “What is the method of the Holy Spirit in the convincement of sin?” inquires the

Andover Review; "Is it not through a crucified and rejected Christ? 'There is more Law,' says Dr. Bushnell, 'in Christ, in His character and life and doctrine than in all statutes besides. The thunders of Sinai are no match for the silent thunders of Calvary.'" From other expressions there made, it seems to be the opinion of the *Andover* men that the Spirit of God, working through the Law alone, is powerless to effect repentance; that to do this Christ has to come and in the Gospel facts—as there understood—furnish the Spirit with the necessary material for convincing the world of sin; and then, that herein is to be found one of the chief causes of divine incarnation. Were it said that repentance could be of no *avail* without Christ, the position might be said to be correctly taken; but to assert that repentance cannot be *wrought* without Christ and His Gospel as the working instrument, and that this is the chief purpose of their giving, is to wipe out the distinction existing between the offices respectively of the Law and the Gospel.

In this, too, is the New Theology quite consistent with itself; and upon close scrutiny it will be found that it utterly fails to discover any essential difference between the two methods of salvation, the one by Moses and the other by Christ. Moses' way is by sanctification, by the personal sanctification of him who is to be saved and saved on account of it; and how, fundamentally and essentially, the way of Christ, as now represented, differs from that of Moses, it is difficult to make out. The difference between them, according to the modern view, is not in the plans themselves, but in the executing forces: Christ by His divine and exemplary—not vicarious and expiatory—life and leadership bringing to bear on the hearts of men—not justifying, but—sanctifying powers such as Moses had

not and could not have at his disposal. Could the Law, at some stage of life, but regenerate and sanctify the sinner, then had he no need of a Savior; his past sinfulness, sins and guilt, however great and grievous they may have been, would all be graciously overlooked, no equivalent for the debt incurred being demanded. If once in some way a person has been made perfectly holy, his past sinful and damnable condition need not trouble him: sin is not such a heinous thing as some would make us believe, neither is the holiness of God so dreadful and His justice so severe as they are here and there described to be; but to His love there is no bound.

That is the way men now-a-days reason on the great affairs of God and the soul; such is the cheap comfort on which they live and hope; and since their troubles and their fears demand nothing better, they are satisfied; but never the soul which is truly sensible of its guilt and feels the most real displeasure of the God whom it has offended, and who demands that perfect satisfaction be rendered—the soul which understands the plain fact, and how very plain it is, that even if one were to keep out of debt to all eternity, thereby not a single past debt is ever paid. But this above all is the question, and the one which more than any other weighs down the penitent sinner's heart: what of thy past sins? And to this the New Theology utterly fails to give an answer that is satisfactory. If it says that God will graciously forgive past sins, it does not take into account divine justice; and the man who sees it is not comforted; and with good reason. If then it add, as it is wont to do, that God will forgive for Christ's sake, the inquirer will want to know, Why for Christ's sake? What may He have done to atone for my sins and to cancel my debt? And the

New Theology answers — *Nothing directly, strictly speaking, nothing at all.* Then, feeling perhaps the complete emptiness of the comfort it endeavors to give, it may, as it will to maintain its position, go on to say that God will pardon the sinner for Christ's sake, because He loves the Son and because the latter is the Head and representation of mankind, and so on. But here again the questions arise: what has the mutual love of the Father and the Son, and what has the relation to me of the Son's friendship and love to do with my justification, if such friendship and love have done nothing to satisfy the holy God whom I have offended? It is not the God of love whom I dread, but the God whom I know to be most holy and righteous, and the one who punishes sins. No, the New Theology has no doctrine of justification that does justice to the nature of God; that accords with the Scriptures, and that can truly comfort the soul; neither can it have such a doctrine, for the simple reason that it has sacrificed to its own whims nothing less than the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. This is its sin, and herein is it a thing accursed before God.

Passing on from the efficient to the formal cause of this so-called justification doctrine, other and most important differences between it and the old doctrine are brought to light. Inasmuch as it substitutes for the imputed righteousness of Christ the personal holiness of the individual, the *causa formalis* of justification is here, plainly enough, made identical with that of sanctification; so that our personal union with Christ and His sanctifying presence in us constitutes the sum and substance of our justification before God — the small matter of His forgetting our past sins excepted. Now this personal union with Christ is effected by faith; and whereas faith is subject to growth and may

be either weak or strong, small or great, and so on, our "justification" is a matter of continual change, its fluctuations keeping pace with the backward or the forward strides of the faith that conditions it. There are degrees in faith, and there are degrees in justification. If, in consequence of this teaching, fears should arise in the minds of any as to their acceptableness before God and their entrance into the kingdom of heaven, the assurance is given them that the germ of the new nature and life planted in their hearts is by God taken for the new and perfect nature and life themselves. Accordingly, a man may enter where, as the Bible says, nothing unclean shall enter, no matter how unclean he may be, if but the principle of future cleanliness or holiness has been deposited in his nature. How the hope of heaven, which is thus held out, practically approves itself in the hearts of men who teach it, we cannot know; though we little doubt that this heresy must beget either false fears or hopes, and both most ruinous, wherever it finds a place to work itself out in.

Contrast with this the doctrine of the Word of God and His Church on the same point, and it becomes more and more apparent that, as it has laid a different foundation so does the New School teach a different way of salvation. The evangelical doctrine likewise teaches a progressive faith, but with no such consequences to man's justification and salvation. According to it, the Christian believer is accounted righteous wholly and solely by virtue and on account of the perfect righteousness which his Savior has acquired for him and bestowed on him; and on account of this righteousness, wholly from without and yet most truly and really his own, he expects to receive the kingdom of heaven with all that that implies. And this righteousness—and

everything to which it is entitled—is his, altogether his, through faith in Christ—yes, through the weakest faith in Christ, only so it be the true faith, faith in the Christ of God, and the faith wrought by His Spirit. Not as if it were a matter of indifference whether that faith be weak or strong, pure or mixed with error: no, never; for, when thieves are near, and they always are, it makes a great difference whether the costly treasure is in hands that are weak or strong and under eyes that are vigilant or weary—but this we desire to hold fast to: that the weakest hand of faith holds the whole Christ, and suffices to save the holder. Then, too, is the further fact recognized here that the degree of faith conditions the believer's personal consciousness, experience, and present state of happiness, as of life generally, with reference to Christ, His righteousness and salvation; but all these are wholly subjective factors which do not affect the one great fact that so long as one has faith in Christ, he is in actual possession of the entire object of his faith; so that we conclude, a man is either justified entirely and perfectly, or not at all. Of a graded justification the Bible knows nothing; and it can find no room where the distinction between it and sanctification is at all preserved.

To the readers who take the trouble to study and follow up the particularizations of this doctrine and its phases as they are given by the different representatives of the Modern Theology, it will soon become apparent that there is a marked difference of opinion between them, so that we may, nay should as a matter of simple justice, divide them into two classes: the one, the Romanizing; the other, the ultra Romish. The latter constitutes the New Theology School proper; while the former, in strong sympathy with it and still not prepared to abandon the doctrine of the Old

School altogether, attempts to mediate between the two, but with results, as a rule, fatal to the old faith. The New Theology proper, as we have seen in our characterization of it, goes beyond Rome in this that it denies the expiatory and substitutionary significance of the life and death of Christ—which Rome does not do altogether—, and that in consequence it repudiates the very idea of a justification except by way of sanctification. When in addition to this it is observed that the anthropology in vogue among the men of this school is strongly pelagianistic, it is not too much to say that on the doctrine under consideration its teachings are worse than Romish.

The other and more conservative class or type, as stated, endeavors to retain the Church's doctrine of the vicarious work of Christ, but would bring it into harmony with the justification theory of the New School. In order to do this, it is taught that the believer is justified by faith in the whole Christ; more particularly, that he is justified by apprehending the righteousness of Christ *and* by receiving into his own nature the life of Christ. Accordingly, the position taken is, that the righteousness through faith which the Scriptures teach, and on account of which we are to consider ourselves the acceptable children of God and heirs of heaven, includes as a part of its substance the renewal of heart and the personal new life. In short, personal holiness is really conceived to enter in somewhat as a constituent element into the *causa meritoria* of our justification. Salvation is thus made to rest both on the righteousness *unto* faith—the objective righteousness of Christ—, and on the righteousness *in* and *of* faith as a virtue—that is, the subjective righteousness of the believer; hence, on a double righteousness, the one a gift from without and the other a

habitus within. When then, as a sort of return step toward the scriptural doctrine of the Church, it is stated that in this life as a rule the objective righteousness is by far the more important part in the *causa justificationis*, it is immediately followed by a leap forward and away from the truth, when we are assured that the objective righteousness shall at one time completely resolve itself into the subjective righteousness; and then shall this last be all in all. The Romanizing tendency here is so strong and manifest, that it may reasonably be doubted whether this justification theory is in any way nearer to the truth than is that of the papists. There is a difference, but one as between error and error, of which the one is about as pernicious as the other.

Our inquiry, in what sense the New Theology believes a forgiveness of sins and teaches a sort of justification doctrine, has served to show at the same time in what way it conceives Christ necessary to and available for salvation. Its other doctrinal statement, therefore, to wit, that without the personal Christ no one can be saved, would hardly require any farther elucidation here, were it not for a strange addition to it in what has been called the theory of

PROBATION AFTER DEATH,

to which the New Theology devotes a great deal of favorable consideration.

The necessity unto salvation of the personal or historic Christ is insisted on by the New Theology over against that of "the essential Christ" by whom rationalism declares many men to be saved. This point is certainly well taken; it is to be regretted, however, that no endeavor is made to maintain it in its absolute fullness. When for example such men as the Andover expositors of Progressive Orthodoxy concede

the salvation of "Socrates, Cato, Aurelius and Buddha" by the essential Christ, and thus admit the exception, the position seemingly taken in the outset is much weakened and virtually abandoned. For, if the light of nature sufficed in the case of some heathens to save them, it certainly follows that it can suffice in the case of all; and that if it does not, the fault is their own, and their condemnation is just. What, moreover, surprises us is, that "Abraham and many of his descendants" are said to have been saved without Christ, and that they are put into the same category with "enlightened" heathens. Most assuredly is the Christ promised and the Christ made manifest one and the same Christ; and it is difficult to see why faith in the promised Messiah—such as Abraham had—should not be able to save as well as faith in the historic Christ.

The extension of the time of grace beyond the grave for the benefit of those who have had no opportunity offered them to come to Christ in this life, is by the New Theology given out for the time being as a mere theory; but as a theory withal which it hopes to establish some day, and to accomplish which it is putting forth its most vigorous efforts. Meanwhile, the *rationale* it has adopted in order to it is, to say the least, of a very doubtful character. It starts out with and reasons from its own broad conceptions of the Deity and of the attributes and ways of God, then walks by the light of reason and draws support from its own moral consciousness, and finally it appeals to the rational and emotional in those whom it would convince—a method, therefore, so thoroughly and extravagantly subjective that the hope of ever reaching sound and lasting results must be very small indeed. The weakness of this line of argument is, of course, felt on all sides; but, as regards the matter in

hand, the advocates of the theory have nothing better to go by. The Scriptures know nothing of a probation after death; and hence, every attempt to establish such a view must necessarily proceed on extra-Biblical grounds.

However, there are passages of Scripture that have a more or less remote bearing on the subject; but, while one or two of these are considered favorable to the theory, the greater number is found to be adverse to it; so that in regard to the Scriptural testimony on the controverted point, the affirmative find themselves almost throughout the whole discussion put on the defense.

The passages claimed as favorable to the theory are 1 Pet. 3, 19 and 4, 6. The prison—*ἡ φυλακή*—spoken of in the former place is said to mean the abode of the dead; and the preaching there done by Christ is taken for a preaching of the Gospel for purposes of salvation. But with what reason the prison referred to by the Apostle can be made to mean the abode of such among the dead as have had no saving opportunities on earth, is not made clear. The passage, on the contrary, distinctly declares who were the spirits in prison to whom Christ preached, namely, “to them which aforetime were disobedient, when the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah.” From this it is evident that the *φυλακή* here mentioned designates the place of the damned. If not, it were difficult to see why especial attention is called to the long-suffering of God on the one hand and, on the other, to the disobedience of the people over against it. The fact is that these people had the same opportunity to be saved as was given to Noah, the “preacher of righteousness” living among them. But Noah, as the Scriptures state, found grace in the eyes of the Lord; and the way mention is made of him throughout indicates that

he is among the blessed in heaven; in Heb. 11, 7 it is even expressly declared that he "became heir of the righteousness which is by faith." Now if the people who at the time of the flood perished in body and soul—comp. also 2 Pet. 2, 5—could have been saved by the grace offered to them no less than to Noah, what reason can there be for the assumption that to them was accorded a special time of grace after death? St. Peter certainly says nothing of the kind in the words before us; but to make it so appear the New Theology would have us to combine verse 6 of chap. 4 with the passage under consideration and then substitute *euαγγελιζεσθαι* = to preach the Gospel, for *κηρύξαι** = to proclaim or to herald abroad. However, there is not the least evidence that the preaching of the Gospel, verse 6, has anything to do with the preaching by Christ to the spirits in prison. In regard to the meaning of verse 6 in chap. 4, it may suffice to state that almost all exegetes interpret the words "might be judged according to men in the flesh" as referring to the judgment which takes place at the time of death; if this be correct, then the sense of the whole passage would be: Also such as are dead Christ shall judge inasmuch as the Gospel was preached to them also while yet living.†

* That this verb is, in the New Testament Greek, used for preaching of the Law as well as of the Gospel may be seen from Matt. 3, 1; Luke 12, 3; Acts 15, 21; Rom. 2, 21; Gal. 5, 11; etc.

† By the way: whence this sudden change of front with regard to the "descendit" in the second Art. of the Ap. Creed? The Heidelberg Catechism, for example, in answer to the question, "Why is it added: He descended into hades" (hell)? says, "That in my greatest temptations I may be assured that Christ, my Lord, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, and terrors which He suffered in His soul on the cross and before, has redeemed me from the anguish and torment of hell." And the Westminster Conf. explains (?) the words descended into hell by saying, "and remained under the power of death." See Dr. Schaff's

It is forcibly and correctly charged against this probation theory—and it applies to the old rationalistic doctrine of heathen salvation just as well—as a peremptory argument, that “even its advocates find only such faint and fragmentary traces of it in all the New Testament.” See *The N. Y. Independent* of March and *The Andover Review* of April. In answer to this the editors of the *Review* remark: “We do not, however, consider this objection a serious one. We prefer”—to a plain statement of Scripture? !—“to inquire if the theory is consonant with the character of God and with the spirit and drift of the Gospel,” p. 409. But the spirit and drift of the Gospel or of the entire Word of God, let us say, holds out no such hopes to the heathens as the Progressive Orthodoxy would establish for them. In all the teachings of the Bible with reference to the condition of men after death, where is there anything said from which such a thing as a state of probation for a certain class can even be deduced? The Bible only knows of a heaven and of a hell; but nothing of an intermediate state, from which men may finally pass into the one place or be driven into the other. So too is there a great deal said about the heathens or Gentiles and the hope that is held out to them; but this hope belongs to the time of grace, to the acceptable year of the Lord, and not to the hereafter. “The times of the Gentiles” no less than those of the Jews, are set for this life, Luke 21, 24 and Rom. 11, 25; excepting these and similar promises the Scriptures speak in any but a hopeful way of the heathen world. “Thou hast rebuked the heathen, Thou

“*Creeds of Christendom*,” Vol. III, p. 621. In other words: Calvinistic theology has all along denied the fact of Christ’s descent into hell; but now that the *descensus* may serve a purpose there would seem to be more in the Ap. Creed than Calvinistic eyes have been able to see in days gone by.

hast destroyed the wicked, Thou hast put out their name for ever and ever," says the Psalmist; and again, "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God;" Ps. 9, 5. 17. And 79, 6 he prays: "Pour out Thy wrath upon the heathen that have not known Thee, and upon the kingdoms that have not called upon Thy name." We admit that these passages and others of a like import, do not necessarily teach that the heathen world is, in a manner absolute, consigned to damnation; but we remember, too, that these are the words of the most holy God, and submit whether a doctrine of future probation is in consonance with them.

Opposed, and in part strongly opposed to the combated theory, are the following passages: Matt. 25, 21-46, and the other descriptions of the final judgment; Rom. chap. 1 and 2; Rom. 5, 10; Luke 16, 19-31; and Heb. 9, 27. Of these we will call attention here only to the last two.

From the words of our Lord in Luke 16 it is evident a.) that there are two states for the dead, "Abraham's bosom" for the godly, and one of "hell and torments" for the ungodly; b.) that the dead are immediately transposed each one to the place where he belongs; and c.) that in the abode of the blessed repentance and faith are no longer called for, and that in the abode of the damned repentance and faith, if possible, are not available. Now that the rich man was ready to make his peace with God is evident from his words to Abraham in behalf of himself and his five brethren; and the question arises: Why was not the Gospel brought to this man? Abraham and the New Theology, too, answer; "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them." Now we admit that the rich glutton, who in his life-time had Moses and the prophets, is not to be classed

with the heathen; and to us, therefore, the story of the rich man and Lazarus in one way gives no conclusive information on the point of controversy. But this is not the case on the side of our opponents; for as long as they put into the same category with the heathen the spirits to whom Christ preached in the prison and who in their life-time had Noah the preacher of righteousness, that long are they constrained to class with them also the rich man in hell who had Moses and the prophets. Thus, from the standpoint the New Theology has taken, Luke 16 tells strongly against the hypothesis advanced.

Hebrews 9, 27 the fact is stated, and stated as if it were a matter of course and a fact generally known, that it is appointed unto men once to die and after that the judgment. To this the New Theology remarks, that it is not stated what lies between. Even so; but is it not a matter of surprise that, if there be such a thing as a state of probation after death for millions of people, not the slightest hint is given of it here or anywhere else in the Bible? How can this silence of the Word of God, which is given to be our light and comfort with reference to all the affairs of our souls, be accounted for? The decision of the question, whether or not there are Gospel opportunities beyond the grave for the heathen, may have little interest for us who have the Gospel here; but it is of the greatest importance to such as are converted from heathendom. And whereas such conversions were many in the days when the Word was given, why is there nowhere a word of comfort to the Gentile Christians with reference to their parents who lived and died in idolatry? We humbly submit: does not the silence of the Word of God on this subject teach us, forcibly teach us, not to be too curious in this matter? Let us be

content with the assurance that God is no respecter of persons, and that on all he will execute a righteous judgment. In a word: where God has given us no revelation, there let us beware of every attempt to set up doctrines; for every endeavor on our part to supplement the Word is a great sin, and one which God will surely punish.

When, lastly, it would appear that this theory of probation is an advance on that of the old rationalists, inasmuch as it insists on salvation only by the historic Christ over against the "essential Christ" of the latter, let it not be forgotten in what sense the modern theologians consider even the historic Christ necessary to salvation. In view of their notions on this last subject, the difference between the two heresies is not nearly as great as at first it may seem to be.

The New Theology, then, summarily characterized, teaches an incarnation of the Son of God, but it places this divine act more in the sphere of creation than in that of grace; and finds it necessitated in the will, if not in the essence, of the Deity rather than in the fact of sin. It virtually does away with Christ the Priest of men and the Bearer of their sins, and makes Christ the King to be all in all. It holds that our sins are forgiven without an equivalent, and that we are the children of God because of our personal union with His Son, and that on account of this sanctifying union heaven is bestowed on us. Finally, that to every man the opportunity is given to be engrafted into Christ, if not in this life, then in the life to come.

In view of the fact that this school is an offshoot of Calvinistic theology, what a change—how radical and how very swift. It is the same old story: from one extreme to another. At first it seemed to be their life's calling to vin-

dicate the righteousness of God, and in order to do it they fought with might and main for the old predestination heresy of their father Calvin. Now the men of this same family—having cast the old damnable heresy to the winds—are ready to lay hold of another, but of one that is not far removed from universalism. Their life's calling now is, to vindicate the universal grace of God, but forgetful of that righteousness for which hitherto they could not do enough. But this much is certain: as long as these people do not abandon their Calvinistic principle of *Scripture and Reason*, they will find truth and safety nowhere, in whatever direction they may go. Herein is to be found the secret cause which explains to us why Calvinism has proved, and continues to prove itself, so very prolific of every manner of sectarianism. The heart of the New Theology, and the worst and the most dangerous thing about it, is rationalism.

“Yes! leave us but Thy Word, we pray;
“The fatal wiles of Satan stay;
“Oh smile upon Thy Church: give grace,
“And courage, patience, love, and peace.”

C. H. L. S.

REASON: ITS PLACE IN THE KINGDOM OF NATURE AND OF GRACE.

BY REV. M. H. HOCKMAN.

The Lutheran Church is often blamed because, as it is thought, she disregards and undervalues reason. It is said: “Reason is one of the chief crowns and exalting endowments of man—one of the distinguishing characteristics that elevates him above the animal world and fits him for

his intended position as 'the lord of creation.'" "Why then," it is added, "is not man privileged to use his reason as a guide and rule, according to which all his actions and conduct, his principles and his faith are decided on and regulated?"

As to the concerns of this world and our daily occupations, in short, our civic relations to our fellow-men generally, this claim may be acknowledged valid enough, in the sense generally understood, to pass uncontradicted, and for all practical purposes suffered to go unchallenged; but as soon as we come to consider our relation to God, and the obligations resting upon us because of this relation, as well as the manner of discharging these obligations, we pass beyond the limits and jurisdiction of reason and enter a domain where reason is insufficient as our guide.

Reason, as a guide for man, has her sphere where knowledge is obtained through the medium of the senses, and where by means of them she can unravel the hidden truths and principles locked up within and operative through the lower works of creation, and, having done this, decide how man shall order his life and exercise himself in his relation to these different works of creation. It is necessary, therefore, if reason is to direct our activities wisely and judiciously, that she correctly grasp and comprehend the nature and character of these works of nature, and also our relation to them; for the theory according to which we act, is framed by reason from the knowledge or the ignorance she possesses of these things. Now if this knowledge is correct, then the line of conduct we pursue in our lives towards these objects will be in consonance with them and all will work smoothly and harmoniously. If, however, our conduct runs counter to the nature and constitution of

these objects, which will be the case when reason fails to understand them aright, then there must be friction and jarring, if not downright strife and destruction. Fortunately, though, since reason has jurisdiction only in the sphere of the lower and the temporal things by which we are surrounded here, any mistakes she may make by way of directing our activities toward these objects can have no more serious consequences than the loss of these temporal objects. So, too, she can bestow upon us no greater favors than the possession of temporal objects and the advantages they possess.

Because of the dire effects of sin, primarily upon the soul, and thence also upon the body, man has become, however, so beclouded in his understanding, warped in his judgment, perverted in his will, and corrupted in his whole being, that his use of reason is often an occasion of stumbling and of falling, of disaster and of shipwreck in the ordinary affairs even of this world. Daily experience and observation show this to be the case, to a greater or less extent, with all. Reason then is by no means an infallible guide, even in her own allotted and legitimate sphere, seeing that these blunders occur while man is employed about things coming under our daily observation, and which are subject to the investigation and examination of our senses —things which we learn to know comparatively well when we see them with our eyes, handle them with our hands, and by personal contact and investigation are enabled to analyze and uncover their hidden parts, or systematise their inner principles and inherent constitutional regulations.

Now since reason can operate, as a guide for man, only in the sphere of the known, and can learn to know only through the medium of the natural senses, whatever lies

beyond the investigation and the reach of the senses cannot belong to the jurisdiction of reason. In the nature of things this must be so. So, too, the fallibilities and errors, the mistakes and blunders with which reason is so often chargeable, even in the lower, and therefore the comparatively well understood sphere allotted to reason as her own peculiar province, might well suggest serious doubts as to her reliability as a guide in the higher spiritual sphere where we are not guided by blind instinct or knowledge gained through the senses, but where we walk by faith. Since the kingdom of grace pertains to what is beyond the reach and the investigation of the senses, these are unable to furnish the knowledge concerning this kingdom which is a necessary prerequisite for reason. Thus we see, that, while reason is measurably adapted to, and qualified for our guidance, as respects our natural relations to our fellow-men and the lower orders of creation, she is utterly and helplessly incapacitated for this position in respect to our relations to God. Here faith, not reason, is our guiding principle,—faith that rests, not upon the knowledge gained through the medium of the senses, but through the medium of Revelation. Now just as the stream can never rise above its fountain head, so too reason and its necessary dependants, the senses, pertaining as they do to the lower plane of this material world, cannot possibly rise to the level of the exalted sphere of grace and glory. To expect this would be not only to overthrow the plain testimony of Revelation, but at the same time to destroy the inner principles of philosophy. This would indeed require reason to change its own characteristics and to become something else than reason.

As is to be expected then, whenever reason is made to

be man's guide in the kingdom of grace, the consequences are most sad and deplorable. The debased and blinded senses are not enabled to know aright man's own self, the lower tangible object belonging to this kingdom. For centuries man's natural powers wrestled with the proposition: "Man, know thyself," and yet fruitless and vain was the task. How worse than fruitless then the thought that man who cannot know himself, should expect to know the other object belonging to this kingdom of grace, the invisible, intangible, omnipotent One, together with the multiplied relations existing between these two objects, intricate and complicated as they are because of the compromising effect of sin! In this case the knowledge upon which reason would be compelled to depend as a basis for her activity would be so woefully at fault that the result could not possibly be anything else than the most miserable failure and disaster—a most pitiable and deplorable instance, truly, of the blind leading the blind, where both would inevitably fall into the ditch, out of which neither could help either self or the other. What folly then for man to follow such a blind guide in a region for which this guide is so utterly and entirely incapacitated, when another guide, fully and perfectly qualified for directing aright all who follow her directions, has been provided!

Here is another striking exhibition of the infinite goodness and wisdom of God, on the one hand, and on the other of the stubborn, rebellious and faithless disposition of man! Alas! man also, as it was said of another, too often "would sooner rule in hell than serve in heaven." Insubordination to, and rebellion against divinely appointed and legitimately constituted regulations and principles has only too often testified to the reigning tendency in unsanctified human powers, reason included.

Although reason cannot be a safe guide, and never was intended for such in the sphere of grace, yet, even in things pertaining to this kingdom, reason is not to be entirely dispensed with by man. It is still to be used by him, but to be used legitimately, reasonably—used not as a ruler or guide for things pertaining to that kingdom, but as a servant of the guide legitimately appointed over this kingdom. Here faith is the guide in whose service everything must be employed. Faith does not banish reason from her domain; she only assigns reason to her appropriate position of servant, while she herself sits upon the throne and wears the crown. She asks obedience to her authority from reason, as well as all the other powers and qualities of man. The whole man must here bow in submission to and honor the ruler whom God Himself has appointed over this kingdom. Now, though reason has a place, and is expected to exercise herself in this kingdom, it is absolutely necessary that she here confine herself to the place designated and appointed for her. Not to do this manifests either an ignorance altogether inexcusable, of the laws and regulations of that kingdom, or a spirit of rebellion against those laws, as well as against the great Lawgiver Himself.

Now just as man, in his totality, is to be, and is to be active, not stagnant or merely passive, in the kingdom of grace, and yet is required to conform to the laws and regulations of this kingdom in all his activities; so too must it be also with those qualities and powers which make up or compose his reason, yea, so it is designed to be with each and every essential and constituent part of his being. To banish reason entirely from the kingdom of grace would virtually be the same as to exclude man himself, as such, from that kingdom, since reason is an essential part of man.

It is not strange or surprising then, or it should not be, to find a place for the exercise of man's reason, as well as all his essential powers when we come to the consideration of our relations to God. All surprise will disappear, if we but assign to man, to the whole man, his proper place of subjection to divinely appointed regulations, and remember that here our knowledge is imparted through the medium of divine Revelation, and that faith in that Revelation is the legitimate, fixed and immutable law that regulates the subjects of this kingdom in all their activities and powers. When reason then thus enters this kingdom she enters it as a servant ready and willing to render obedience to the established regulations and to carry out the constitutional principles of that kingdom. Such being the case, it will then be in accordance with the recognized obligation of reason to order all her activities and bend all her energies to establish and promote the claims of faith, and to recognize as the legitimate testimony as to what is truth, only the divine testimony given in the word of Revelation, the divine Word. Thus reason, as well as all the other powers of man are brought into exercise in the kingdom of grace, as designed and intended of God, when they come into complete captivity and obedience to faith. Thus the whole man, who in the kingdom of nature is a lord, becomes a servant in the kingdom of grace; and yet, stooping to serve and while serving he empties himself of himself and is filled instead with the mind and spirit of God, he becomes truly free; yea, more, a ruler and a king.

The trouble however is that man is so often disposed not only to use, but to serve reason, making her his guide and ruler where she is designed and appointed to be only a servant. This is nothing else than insubordination to, and

rebellion against the laws and the Lawgiver in this kingdom. What God has here joined together man would put asunder, and what God has established and appointed man would destroy and overthrow. From the very beginning of the Christian Church this evil tendency has been at work, and only too often has the tendency manifested itself as a controlling principle, where from an unwillingness to bend the reason and indeed all the powers of man submissively to the announced facts of Revelation, men will instead doubtingly say: "How *can* these things be!" "Except I . . . *see and put my finger into the print of the nails* I will not believe." That is, "I will not believe unless I am convinced on the testimony of my own senses.

The predominating form of this error is that in which it is acknowledged we need the aid of divine Revelation, instead of our own senses merely, to learn certain facts concerning the kingdom of grace, and, having learned these, *then* reason is to be our guide, directing our actions and principles according to what she decides as right and best, in view of these facts and this knowledge received through the medium of revelation. This is a more covered and concealed form of the error than the one which denies all need of revelation, and yet, for this very reason, a more dangerous one. Because the rebellious opposition to God's appointed regulation is partly concealed under the appearance of deference to His appointments, the unwary are all the more likely to fancy they are bringing an acceptable service of obedience and honor, when, in reality, they are dishonoring and disobeying the very fundamental regulations of this His kingdom. In such case, reason, designed to be a servant, would be exalted to the position of ruler, while faith would be degraded to the rank of servant, if not, indeed, entirely banished from the kingdom.

This form of error is especially active in corrupting the doctrines of the Church, and also in undermining the consciousness of a necessity for all doctrines—indeed of all objective truth, and of faith in that truth.

When, for example, Revelation says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," reason replies: "How can a man be benefited by water? There is no virtue, efficacy or grace in it, or connected with it. Therefore, this passage is not to be understood as teaching what it says." When Revelation says: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins," reason replies: "There is, and can be, no connection between the application of water to the body and the removal of sin from the soul. Therefore baptism has nothing to do with the removal of sin. Baptism does no good—at best it is only a rite given to those, who have already received good elsewhere and otherwise.

Now although this seems to be giving some countenance to Revelation, it is in fact nothing more than submitting Revelation to the control of reason. So much of Revelation as is within the grasp, and as is according to what reason had predetermined it should be, is received and acknowledged as valid and true, while all that does not come up to this standard is rejected or explained away as meaning something entirely different from what it so often and so plainly declares.

So too when Christ according to the divine Word says: "Take eat, this is my body, etc." reason replies: "This is not true, if understood as stated. It should be understood as if He had said, 'This *represents* my body, or *reminds* you of my body.'" Here, too, reason forgetting that she is a servant designed to sit submissively and humbly at the feet of the

Master and honor His authority and kingship, would drag Him from the throne and consign Him to the humble position of a servant while she herself usurped the throne and swayed the scepter. How much more becoming to the creature, reason, it would be, to reply to the Creator—yea, how much more reasonable, even, for her to say: “The Lord Christ certainly knew *what* He wanted to say. He also knew *how* to say it. Therefore, what He said is what He *wanted* to say.” Or again: “The Lord is true and faithful. Therefore if He had wished us to believe something different from what He tells us, He would have told us something *different* from what He did tell us.—What matters it if I cannot comprehend and understand *how* all this is, and comes about? My Lord understands it all, and, having all power, He can and does bring it to pass.—Yea, blessed be God! I cannot understand it, because its riches and mercy transcend the utmost boundaries of my limited comprehension.—Then, too, in the plan of salvation there are *mysteries*—*GREAT mysteries*. It is but natural, I cannot grasp and understand it all.” This is the spirit that rules in the mind and over the actions of those who walk by faith and not by sight. As Moses left the plains below and journeyed to Pisgah’s top, where the fair and goodly land met his gaze, so too, he who leaves the vale of sensuous vision and ascends the Mount of Faith has his trusting eyes feasted on the treasures of truth, while all the avenues of the soul are opened up to, and expanded in the realization and the appropriation of God’s multiplied and marvelous mercies. Thus the subject is brought not only to, but into conformity to the ruler, the servant to the master, the creature to the Creator, while God is thereby glorified and man, saved and delivered from the dominion and bondage of sin, is made free in and through the truth.

These examples only serve to show how each and every doctrine is capable of corruption and how they have, alas! been corrupted time and again. — Here too it is seen how the divine Word is made to bend and yield to the perverted and limited powers of man's vain and boastful reason — the divine Word being permitted to take in no greater scope of truth and glory than what is confined within the narrow limits of man's circumscribed mental powers. This presumptuous lord would thus deny all dominion and authority beyond his own little kingdom, and, ignorant of the great continents of truth and beauty lying beyond his little island, like Selkirk of old exclaims:

*"I am Monarch of all I survey,
My right there is none to dispute."*

Thanks be to God that our Lutheran Church truly honors both God and reason, when she follows His wise and holy will in assigning her the servant's place when standing in the presence of the Creator.

THE USE OF EXCITATION IN DISCOURSE.

Many and grievous as are the abuses to which the power of exciting human feelings has been subjected, the legitimacy of using this power should never have been denied. The fact that demagogues have accomplished their mischievous ends by appeals to the passions of man, and that fanatics have employed wild excitement as their principal instrument of evil, has created a prejudice against a noble power which may be safely and effectually used in the cause of righteousness. Especially the public speaker has opportunity to make its influence felt, and he neglects one of the

mightiest means which God has put within his reach, if he permits an unfounded dislike for excitement and fear of its effects to deter him from any address to the sensibilities in the furtherance of his purposes. Even in the sermon it has a legitimate place, and it is for that reason especially that we here invite attention to the subject, believing that prejudice against such address can only be a hindrance to power in preaching the Gospel.

That there are some dangers besetting the employment of excitation, as there are dangers connected with the use of implements generally, we do not mean to deny. Least of all do we desire to appear as the apologist of any abuse of address to the feelings. Our object is rather to distinguish the use from the abuse, that while a warning voice is lifted against the latter, the former may be held in honor and allotted its proper place.

It is necessary, in the first place, to notice the difference between the investigation and study of a subject and the enforcement of the truth and duty ascertained by the process. While we are engaged in the investigation, it is manifestly a fault to let the feelings exert an influence. They warp the judgment. Passion blinds. The more free the intellect is kept from the power of the desires and affections, the greater is the prospect of reaching rational results and sound conclusions. The more coolly and deliberately the judgment proceeds in examining facts and evidences, or, which is the same thing, the more it is kept free from the heat of passion and allowed to look without perturbation on things as they are objectively presented, the more promise there will be of finding the true and the right. The wish must not be permitted to become father to the thought. Excitement of feeling flurries and confuses. It

shakes the mental heart and renders the intellectual eye unsteady, so that the object becomes indistinct and blurred. We are making no plea for the investigation of truth through a medium that colors or distorts. Let that be as calm and as dispassionate as the human mind can make it.

Similarly, when the results of our investigations are presented for the instruction and conviction of other minds, there should be no emotional machinery set to work which would warp their judgments and prevent a clear and intelligent view of the subject set before them. What is right and requisite for ourselves, whilst we are engaged in investigation, is right and requisite also for others while they must be regarded as investigators, who are to be led to the same intelligent results which we have reached. They are not to be contemptuously driven like cattle, but treated as our rational equals, with souls and responsibilities like ourselves, and therefore calmly and dispassionately instructed and convinced. The rule must therefore be to appeal first to the intellect. That must be the rule, although there are cases of great necessity and danger when the king's business demands such haste that no time is left for thorough explanation and proof, and men must be moved to action by direct address to their sensibilities and will. Apart from such rare exceptional cases, where the deterring motive is one of charitable concern for the welfare of our fellow men, where interests cannot, under the stress of necessity, be subserved in the ordinary way, it is wrong to treat our neighbors, made in the image of God like ourselves, and endowed with intelligent souls like our own, as if they were irrational creatures who need not know the grounds of their beliefs or their actions, and must not be expected to give any reason for the hope that is in them. Men should know the

truth and the right, and act intelligently when they are called to action. That makes it necessary to examine dispassionately and, when we proceed to utilize the results of our examination in discourse, to enable others to examine dispassionately what we have to present. Zeal without knowledge has the condemnation of reason as well as of Holy Scripture, and sobriety is a virtue that commands itself to the understanding and consciousness of all men.

But while this is urged as a warning against the abuse of excitation, a remark seems to us necessary as a safeguard against misapprehensions. It is this: No intelligent person who knows the constitution of the human soul, will claim that there should be no enlistment of the feelings in the cause of truth and right as God enables us to see them. They are precious, and no man must presume to forbid us the right to love them. That is not only a sacred right, but a paramount duty. All investigation would be worthless, if the heart were forbidden to appreciate the results attained. That would only be another form of saying that they are worth nothing and that the time spent in the acquirement is wasted. And if we love them, that love will beam through the presentation, and will seek ways and means to excite an interest in them, that attention may be arrested and directed to them in discourse. That need not and should not interfere with a calm and dispassionate exhibition of the subject to the understanding and an evil and lucid array of the evidence upon which our judgment rests. But if that should be supposed to constitute any disqualification for a thoroughly calm and clear setting forth of a subject to the human intelligence, it is plainly a supposed disqualification that lies in the nature of the soul as God created it, and must therefore ultimately be not derogatory to truth and

righteousness, but, as God loves them and has arranged all things to promote them, a means of advancing their interests. He who does not love truth and righteousness has no business to set himself up as a teacher of them, or to pretend the advocacy of their sacred cause. Whatever influence such appreciation and affection may have upon the deliberate presentation of the results of our careful study in discourse, is perfectly proper and legitimate, and is not designed to be embraced in our warning against the abuse of excitation.

It is necessary, in the second place, to keep in mind the difference between employing excitation for the mere amusement of an audience, and employing it for the purpose of influencing the will and producing action. Oratory is indeed an art, but it does not consist only in pleasant combinations of sounds, like music, and does not, like this beautiful art, attain its end by merely exciting emotions of pleasure. It is a prostitution of the power of pathos when it is used in discourse without a purpose lying beyond the excitement and the delight which it affords. No man that is conscious of the earnestness of life and its work will consent to degrade a noble power by employing it in a manner so unworthy. Least of all can such excitation for theatrical effect be tolerated in the pulpit. The general feeling of contempt for a speaker who is known or suspected to have no object but that of affording amusement by playing upon the feelings, is founded upon right views of the dignity of speech and the responsibility of the speaker. To say that a man is theatrical in discourse means that he is not sincere and must not be trusted. Excitation is a means to effect the general end of discourse, and it is always abused when that end is left out of view, and another end, such as pleas-

ure in the hearer or admiration for the speaker, is substituted.

It follows from this that excitation is always abused when it is addressed merely to the emotions, which have no object, but spend their force in the soul without reaching outward or acting on other mental powers which move to action, instead of being addressed to the desires and affections, which in their nature are motive powers, and through which the hearer may be stirred to appropriate activity. Exciting emotions that result in nothing is trifling with the souls of hearers as well as with the powers of the speaker.

But even when the motive powers are addressed the theory that amusement is a legitimate end of excitation in discourse is vicious in its operation. Where desires or affections are awakened without presenting real objects upon which they may act, the design being merely to awaken the pleasure of feeling, the effect on the sensibilities is pernicious. So far as such feelings must have an object, it is left to the imagination to furnish it, and the fictitiousness of the object reacts upon the sentiment. All becomes dreamy and unreal. Sham objects of affection beget sham affections. Hence it evinces that men and women of gushing sentimentality are oftentimes practically the most hard-hearted and unfeeling of wretches, who melt at the first touch of the speaker's warm appeal, but who never move a finger to afford relief or help to the suffering and needy. Their hearts are burnt out by the fires of sentiment, and all their sentimentalism is a miserable cheat, of which they themselves are the principal victims. Accustomed to spend all the strength of their motives on creatures of the imagination and to treat the feelings as mere sources of personal enjoy-

ment, they have no impulse to purge such self-indulgence and practice self-denial for the alleviation of the real suffering in the world around them. Hence the strange phenomena, so often witnessed in actual life, of feeling pity for suffering without a penny to relieve it, and of whining sympathy with the unfortunate without a turn of the hand to help them. God forbid that we should speak a word in defence of a theory that is productive of such pitiful consequences. The abuses of excitation are great, and we lift an earnest voice of warning against them.

But that does not militate against the proper use. It must not be allowed to warp our judgment and create a prejudice against a power that God has created for good. In spite of the manifest abuse, we put in a plea for the use. We do not regard many words necessary for this purpose, but we do regard the few considerations which we have to urge worthy of the serious attention of all who are called to use discourse, and especially of those, who are called as ministers of the Church.

In the first place, the objects of discourse cannot be fully attained without appealing to all the powers of the soul. The object of speech is to impress upon men the truth which we have learned and the duty which we feel. What has taken hold of our souls is to be urged upon the souls of others. So far as that is a mere matter of information and science, as when history or botany is taught, there seems to be no need of anything further than an address to the pure intellect. So when instruction is given in regard to the contents of Holy Scripture, it may be considered a purely intellectual exercise. The object is to impart knowledge as to what has occurred in the world, what is the nature, form, and development of vegetable life,

what are the facts, doctrines, and duties presented in the Bible. That is an important object. But is that really all? Has the heart of the historian no interest in the facts which he narrates and in the lessons which they teach, and is it none of his business what impressions they may make upon the student? Has the teacher of botany no right to have his sensibilities enlisted in the wonders which his intellect contemplates and his science sets forth, and no duty in regard to the influences which the truth may exert upon the sensibilities of his pupils? And the teacher of religion—has he really nothing to do but to present the objective truth to the cold intellect of the learner? Has he a right to close his heart against its gracious influence, and to treat his pupils as if they had no hearts to feel these influences and had no concern in the precious truth revealed except as a matter of science? Can he give an account of his stewardship if he shows no other than an intellectual interest in the truth and the duty which he teaches, and deals with his hearers as if they had no souls to save, or did not care whether they are saved or not, if they have such souls? The object of discourse is not accomplished by such a one-sided handling of important themes. Even when the subject-matter is one of pure science, the heart is not entirely dormant. The fact is that teachers have hearts and the learners have hearts, and when occasion offers these hearts will be enlisted in that which engages attention, simply because those whose attention is engaged are human. Influences will therefore be exerted, in spite of all our theories, upon the sensibilities, and thoughtful men will take account of this and utilize their opportunities. We would not even have mathematics taught by an infidel. It is dangerous, not because mathematics as such may be Christian or anti-

Christian, but because teachers and pupils have hearts as well as heads, and may be influenced even in a study so purely intellectual as mathematics.

But aside from this, the business of life is not mere science, and discourse has not to deal with mere science. Even supposing that there are subjects with which the heart has nothing whatever to do and which the pure intellect can set forth as if it were not associated with sensibilities in the same soul, no one will be likely to dispute that there are at least some subjects which cannot be thus treated. In any case, therefore, our argument will stand, that as discourse must have for its object the minds of men, it fails of accomplishing its full purpose if excitation is excluded. It is sadly crippled in its influence when an important element of the human soul is overlooked.

In the second place, discourse has an ultimate object which it is impossible to attain without the employment of excitation and persuasion. While the immediate object is the mind addressed, the purpose is through the influence exerted upon the mind to attain an end which lies beyond. The person influenced is himself a means. He is to be employed as an instrument. All his powers are to be set in motion for the accomplishment of the speaker's ultimate purpose. We will not stop here to debate the question whether this is true of all discourse in all its forms and applications, although to a Christian mind, which has come to an adequate realization of the scriptural rule to do all things to the glory of God, this is no longer a debateable question. It will suffice for our present purpose to keep in view what no one disputes, that at least in many instances discourse must aim at something beyond the mind addressed. There is something to be done, and men must be

moved to do it. The speaker clearly sees a noble object and his heart yearns to achieve it. Let lumpish and lethargic men complain that he is warm. "Who is not warm when what he speaks he feels?" His appreciation of the end to be reached sets his soul aglow, and how could he otherwise than exert all his power to impart his warmth to other souls, that they too may be moved to activity in a cause that has not only commended itself to his judgment, but also won his affections? "My zeal hath consumed me," says the psalmist, and why should it not? The true and the right and the good are not things of indifference to men of moral earnestness, least of all to Christian men. Impressed with their importance for the welfare of man as well as for the glory of God, how could they urge them upon their fellow-men with the indifference that chills, instead of pleading their cause with that ardor that sets other hearts on fire and arouses to energetic action? The will is not moved by cold ratiocination, and all explanation and argument, necessary as they are to prepare the way for intelligent action, fail in the work of the world and the warfare of life as long as men only listen and perhaps admire the speaker, but remain unmoved and inactive.

There is no need whatever to be frightened by the chimera that sin lies in the sensibilities, and that any and every appeal to them must therefore be to our sinful nature. That is a mere confusion of ideas. Our affections and desires are indeed sinful, as everything else that is in us partakes of the sin in our nature. So is our judgment and our understanding sinful. "The whole head is sick and the whole heart is faint." Isa. 1, 5. But the affections belong to our nature just as well as the reason, and therefore so far as discourse can appeal to man at all for the exer-

cise of influence, it can appeal as freely and as righteously to the affections as to the reason. Neither the one nor the other is in its essence sinful; both are sinful in their abuse and perversion. And when the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit is introduced, it sanctifies the heart as well as the head. The affections and desires can be exercised in the cause of holiness as well as in the cause of sin, and the more, under the supernatural power of divine grace, we can enlist them in the cause of righteousness, the better it will be for mankind.

Preachers of the Gospel have everywhere experienced, to their great sorrow, that men may know the right and have ample conviction of their duty, and yet take but lamentably little part in the great work which Christ has commissioned His Church to perform. Is this perhaps owing, in part, to their fear lest the employment of excitation should lead to fanaticism? Let such fears be banished. Fanaticism is the zeal of the flesh mingling with good desires in souls that lack clear knowledge. There is no danger of that where the Lutheran system of instruction is in vogue. The danger among us is rather that while the needful light is imparted, the walk as children of light will be neglected, and the needful work will not be done. Let the kingdom of darkness see that we are in earnest in the warfare which we wage against it. That will render our words hot shot in the battle. Let the kingdom of light see that hope and happiness, in life and death and eternity, is felt to hang in no little measure upon the cause which we advocate. That will render our words warm and our entreaties earnest. "It is good to be zealously affected always in a good thing." Gal. 4, 18.

L.

ART IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

By Prof. Dr. H. Schmidt, of Breslau, translated by G. H. S.

The last Congress for Home Missions, held at Breslau, listened to the discourse of a specialist on the educational importance of art for the life of a people. Under this general head of the educational value of art, the ornamentation of houses of worship and their artistic decoration were also included. But the discourse in question did not propose to discuss the question whether such artistic ornamentation always is in harmony with the interests of public worship; whether it is an indifferent feature as far as this worship is concerned, and desirable merely as a paedagogical auxiliary; or if, finally, the public service itself, according to its own nature, demands art as a means for its ends. The carrying out of the wishes expressed by Dr. Koegel's discourse concerning the use to be made of art in public service, must certainly be subordinated to the discussion of the problems just mentioned. It is well known, that the Reformed Church made it an object to remove from all the church-edifices of which it took possession everything that looked like art, and how the same Church in erecting new houses of worship, excluded everything of an artistic nature. And this idea is not one of the past merely. New church-buildings, e. g. those of the Wupper valley, are characterized by an entire exclusion of all art; and the absolute bareness and plainness of the unartistic prayer-meeting places of the United Brethren are doubtless not to be attributed to poverty, since they have many wealthy friends, but it is a matter of principle with them. But even where art is not excluded on principle, the manner and possibility of its application for the purposes of public services are differently regarded

by those who consider it as an essential means for the purpose of service and edification than do those by whom its connection with the cultus is considered rather an accidental than an essential feature. Before entering then upon the question as to which of the arts can be used in the aid of public worship, the question of principle must be answered, namely, that of the relation of art to public service in general. But this question again cannot be answered without some preliminary statements in regard to the nature both of church service and of art.

We are probably not going too far in saying that the question as to the actual purpose of public worship upon which the theologians themselves have not yet come to an agreement, has not even been brought to the attention of a great majority of the laymen. We who are Evangelical Christians are indeed accustomed to see in the sermon the leading feature of public service, and to estimate the sermon according to the common rule of effect applied to human speech in general. The value of a public service is thus considered to be dependent upon the measure of interest the sermon arouses. If the sermon succeeds in revealing or making plainer to us a truth, hitherto unknown or not understood, if it succeeds in arousing us to a certain duty of Christian life, if it succeeds in awakening our imagination, to please us, then we think that the object of the public services has been attained. But on this basis we can scarcely be able satisfactorily to answer an educated man, should he say that he already knows beforehand what the preacher will say; that poets and authors suffice to awaken his imagination; and that if he wants such an answer to religious problems, he can search for it in books which will give it to him more thoroughly and better than the preacher

can. It is doubtless the lot of only a small minority of preachers, who are successful in arousing such an interest on the part of the congregation in themselves, that crowds will gather around them merely because they are great orators. A theologian, who is himself not regularly engaged in the work of the ministry, and therefore may often have the opportunity to listen to a sermon, will probably be the first critically to measure the sermons of another; and when he is unfortunate enough often to feel beforehand, that the sermon will contain but little for his needs and wishes, what is it that in spite of all this moves and draws him on to take part in the public service? Is it the force of habit that impels him; or possibly the thought of giving a good example to those who have had fewer opportunities of learning than he has had? Or does he think of rendering God a service by going Sunday after Sunday to the house of worship, even at the risk of being dissatisfied with the sermon or even repelled by it?

An Evangelical theologian even will not say that his heart is entirely steeled and strengthened against this latter evil; it springs from the natural heart. For is not the worship of God a service of God? Is it not its object to worship Him, and to show our obedience to Him? Are we not told by the third commandment not to despise preaching and God's Word? The extra-Christian religions have no other conception of the matter than that worship is also a service which the divinity has a right to demand. In the centre of the heathen systems stands the sacrifice as a means of securing the favor of God; and according to the ideas of the old Greeks Goethe's Prometheus is not mistaken when he defies the gods with these words: "Ye nourish with difficulty your majesty by the tributes of worship and odors of in-

cense." The gods indeed are considered as needing in a most material sense the offerings of men. In every case they watch jealously that their honor and worship in the most ostentatious manner is not refused them by their devotees. In Israel also sacrifices constituted the centre and highest development of divine worship, so that as a result that peculiar idea easily gained prevalence which gave the prophets so just an occasion for repremanding the people, namely, that the outward performance of the sacrificial act in itself constituted a work acceptable to God, the so-called *opus operatum* idea. Sacrifices are condemned by the prophets only when divorced from the inner submission of the heart; only when they are made as a substitute for purity of hands and of deeds, are they attacked by the prophets. It would be wrong to conclude that the institution of sacrifices as such is offensive to the Old Testament prophets or considered as contrary to the divine will.

How deeply this idea, that sacrifice is the real centre of divine worship, has taken root in the natural heart is most evident from the history of the Church and from the cultus in the Church of the Middle Ages. Already at an early date the conviction gained ground that no services could be held without the sacrificial act and hence without a priest; and that mysterious gift of grace made by the Lord, in which He bestows upon the congregation the fruit of His sacrificial death, was considered as a sacrifice to be offered for the congregation, and thus the sacrifice and not the sacrament became the centre of worship in the cultus of the Middle Ages, by the side of which all the other features of worship sank into insignificance. Consistently with this the public worship in the Middle Ages was considered as a meritorious service. Participation in worship was made a law for the

members of the Church, the compliance with which entitled to divine grace. And although we Evangelical Christians theoretically strongly oppose this idea, it nevertheless makes its influence felt practically also among us. "I at least want to do my duty," is often assigned as a reason for desiring private communion on the death-bed.

And yet even in the old Testament a different conception of the purposes of public worship is found. "When shall I come and appear before God?" asks the writer of the 42. Psalm. Has not the house of God been created in the building of the temple at Jerusalem? Does not he who enters there approach the gracious presence of the living God? Is not the exalted pleasure of enjoying the communion with God Himself associated with the altars of the Lord Zabaoth? And even among the heathens this idea of divine worship is not lacking. Why did they build temples for their gods? Why did they worship these gods? The Apostle Paul says, Acts 17, that they did it to see if they could feel and find Him. Of course this longing was not realized. Their altars were dedicated only to a god unknown to them. They were dumb idols whose communion they sought, whose voices they endeavored to hear out of the rustling of the leaves or out of the unintelligible utterings of half-crazed prophetesses. And in Israel also—was it not a hidden God who dwelt in the darkness of the Holy of holies? No sign or gift of grace did the pious pilgrim expect in the courts of his God. It is true that Israel was blessed with a divine revelation, in which the synagogue of later times sought edification. But however great the wisdom and the miracles which the people found to admire in the law, the God of the people did not in the synagogue even speak without a medium nor show His presence immediately.

As the whole extra-Christian religion was only a longing and seeking for God and as even the revelation from God did nothing but lead this seeking and longing in the right path, thus too the divine service was only prayer and sacrifice, but not yet the experience of the divine presence.

What the extra-Christian world sought and longed for, that has been revealed and given through Christ. Does not Christianity start out with the proclamation: Behold your God! Is there not more in Christ than in Solomon and his temple, namely a holy of the holies in whom dwells the fullness of the Godhead bodily and which is no longer closed to the congregation by a curtain? Does not the worshipper who here wishes to see the countenance of God, and who prays with Philip: Lord, show us the Father, and it sufficeth us (John 14, 8), meet with the response: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father?" And the Word which has been given to the congregation of the New Testament is no longer a word of the law but one of spirit and of life, and the Gospels are the Cherubim, upon which the living God comes to His congregation in Christ. Here then a real and entire communion in Spirit and in truth is possible. But for this very reason it would seem that a special public service would necessarily fall away entirely. The worship in the Spirit and in truth cannot be bound to time or place. Neither Jerusalem nor Gerazim is the place where men are to worship, and that Jesus, in whom the divine fulness has appeared, has ascended to heaven to fulfill all things. New moons and Sabbaths are not consistent with Evangelical freedom. Now we are to pray at all times. The heart itself is the temple of God, where He dwells with His spirit and His gifts. A reasonable service consists in offering of one's own body, as we are told by the Epistolary

lesson for the first Epiphany Sunday. Or it is, as St. James exhorts a pure and undefiled service which consists in visiting the widows and orphans in their affliction, and in keeping ourselves undefiled before the world? True; but how much is yet lacking that this sacrifice of ours is perfect, that these prayers are uttered unceasingly; how much is yet wanting that the gracious communion of God is always made manifest in us in its power! The perfect worship we expect only then when sin no longer pollutes the offering of the sacrifice, and when the praise of those who are saved will flow continually from their lips, because every moment is occupied in the enjoyment of the gracious presence of God.

It is easily understood from this seemingly natural idea that the object of public worship has been defined by some to be merely a kind of a preparation for the true worship or as the fulfillment of a duty toward the Christian communion. We are justified in saying that the latter theory is the leading one in Reformed circles. The public worship of God is regarded as a compliance with the duty of showing reverence to God, a worship instituted by God Himself, which at the same time is to be an incitement to the congregation to faith. From this standpoint the Reformed Church thought herself justified in denying all claims of any particular form of divine worship unless it had a foundation in a Biblical order or at least had an analogy in Biblical history. In so far as the worship of God includes the express acknowledgment of his unconditioned supernatural character, art, which is adapted to chaining the imagination and the soul to the things of this world, seems to contradict the idea of divine worship. It cannot be said that the peculiar Lutheran conception of divine worship

has in all its consequences made itself felt over against this standpoint. In so far indeed as she (the Lutheran Church) treasures the Gospel as the preaching of the word of grace and sees in this word the bearer of the spirit of God, she has also recognized in the worship of God the means of securing to the human heart a special gift of grace. But as the preaching of grace (in the days of rationalism—Ed.) gradually became more and more the presentation of certain doctrinal subjects, the public worship seemed more and more to find its essential aim in instruction, however much a special working of the spirit was thought connected with it. And when the pietistic movement took offense at this dogmatic system of preaching, it could give as the object of public worship only the effecting of conversion. Public worship accordingly was to be practiced only in order to bring about the possibility of an actual communion with God, but not to offer the same. Only a study of one's own heart, only the withdrawal from the world was to be effected by public worship; and in so far as a communion comes into consideration in public worship, the pietists seemed to be satisfied with a mere closer union of converted people and not the connection with a larger mixed congregation. From this standpoint it is easily understood how a pietistic author, in answer to the writer's agreement with H. Thiersch's words, that he could not understand that peculiar taste which preferred the gloomy Puritan meeting-house to a Gothic Cathedral, could say that by these words the taste of the Pietists had also been condemned. That, more than the rest, the ideas of the older rationalists, who knew only "popular teachers" but no pastors and preachers, converted public service into an institution for moral instruction and in this manner could not find any connection between it and art, needs scarcely to be mentioned.

It must be admitted that these conceptions of Christian worship contain some grains of truth. In relation to the perfected communion with God, for which we wait, all our earthly service must ever have a preparatory character; and in relation to the service which should occupy our whole life, the special service in a certain sense is a means. Accordingly the sermon will still be compelled to teach and to exhort, in order first to show the members of a congregation how they can enter into the communion with God and be preserved in it. The worship of God in a special sense has also, in fact, a divine order, and purports to serve the communion. It is accordingly not wrong if we go to church also for the purpose of showing a good example, and consider it our duty publicly to confess the name of God through prayer and thanksgiving; and it would be sad, if the preaching were not also to effect a knowledge of salvation and awaken a love to the Savior.

And yet from a Lutheran standpoint the main object of divine service must be sought for in something else. In truth, the temple and dwelling-place of the God who is revealed in Christ, every Christian should be and Christ should dwell in him. The Lord says, that where two or three are assembled in His name He will be in the midst of them. Therefore, where the Christian cannot come to the full enjoyment of the gracious presence of his Savior in his heart, he enters into a congregation assembled in the name of the Lord, in order to partake again in a more vivifying manner, of this communion. In truth, to pray at all times and at all places, is the Christian's watchword. But when the hands become tired and the confusion of the world great, then there where the congregation is assembled, to which the Lord has promised His presence, the church

will be, a house of God and of the Lord, where the world's confusion ceases, and the promise becomes a power, which has been given, that where two or three agree as to what they will pray for, it shall be given them. Yes indeed, all our deeds should be a service of God and our whole life a sacrifice; but when the sacrifice becomes too heavy for us and the serving tires too much, when the power of faith becomes weak, is it not the word of the Lord, that well-known word, when it is preached, or when it is read, that always again as a fountain refreshes and strengthens us? True, the real service of God and the full solemnity of worship is something of the future. But He who has promised to His children that He would anew drink of the fruit of the vine with them in His Father's kingdom, has He not given them the foretaste of this in the Holy Supper, in which He offers Himself living and present to be partaken of by His congregation as in no way else? And when the congregation, in the *praefatio*, greets the Christ who has appeared in their midst, with the words: "Holy, holy, holy is He that cometh in the name of the Lord," she proposes to do in company with all the angels and the elect. When Christians as a class are told by the Epistle to the Hebrews, that they have come to that festive assembly and congregation of the first born, whose names are written in heaven, it is the object of public worship to impress this upon their souls.

Yea, this is worship in truth. This it is intended to be, an enjoyment and experience of future glory; and in the house of God the congregation is to ascend the mount of transfiguration, upon which raised above daily existence and doings, she can uninterruptedly taste the heavenly blessings which have been given her in Christ, and can enjoy the future world, which has been revealed to her in Him, the

world of that God who has revealed Himself as the Father. Our whole life should indeed be a worship of God, but because the Christian is a growth, and because his worship of God, as long as he is upon earth and in the midst of his struggles, is very imperfect, therefore in the midst of his work he should enjoy that future of his in which that which is imperfect shall cease and where faith shall be converted into sight. This is the greatness, the glory of Christianity, that it transfers this future glory into the very present; that it not only teaches us how to seek God and how we can and should win His grace, but that it also offers this God Himself and His gifts and blessings; that it gives what elsewhere can only be sought after. And this feature must also find its expression in public worship. For that reason the characteristic mark of Christian, and especially Evangelical worship, is not the sacrifice, not prayer, not the exhortatory, consolatory, or reproving testimony for the preparation of our communion with God, but the highest idea in an Evangelical public service is the reception of the Gospel, the celebration of the effected communion with God.

This experience of the glory to come, which is characteristic of Christian and Evangelical worship, of course does not exclude the other features of this worship. How can a congregation rejoice in its God unless it is also willing to offer itself as a sacrifice to Him? The sacrifices acceptable to God, such as the fruit of the lips, prayer and thanksgivings, also belong to the Evangelical worship; and the hearts that come out of the unrest and diversion of the world, certainly stand in need of consolation and admonition, until they are able to leave the world behind them in order to breathe the atmosphere of a future world. And

again, if the children of men are allowed to ascend the Mount of Transfiguration, this is done, not that they should say, "It is well with us here," but that they shall descend again strengthened and, in the world, with renewed earnestness and zeal practice the worship of God. The preached word should indeed also be profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction in righteousness, but its chief object should be the presentation of the Gospel as a power of God to save us; and we are to be drawn to the house of God not only because we expect to increase our knowledge, not at the promptings of our will, but by the hunger and the thirst for the Gospel.

We are indeed to be drawn to the house of God by the sense of duty to worship our God and our Savior, by the duty of offering ourselves to Him, of thanking Him, but still more by the longing for the living Savior, whom we find there, who in a mysterious way there becomes our own. And in case we know that we cannot expect a sermon entirely satisfactory, and even if the promptings and needs of our own hearts do not compel us, we should and may nevertheless be drawn to the house of worship by the duty of encouraging the congregation, of showing a good example to others, so that they do not desert our assemblies; but yet more than this the longing for the communion with all the saints and with the festive congregation of the congregation above should impel us. The means to exalt us to this future world are Word and Sacrament; and, since the former is generally considered chiefly as the word as it is proclaimed, it is evident, how also with this conception of public worship, the sermon preserves its high significance, and how out of this conception only a certain modification of the purpose and aim of the sermon re-

sults, which object the sermon can accomplish without endangering its purposes in other directions.

But this conception of public worship shows farther why the Lord's Supper is with right considered as occupying a position in a certain sense even higher than the sermon. This exalted importance of the Lord's Supper has indeed not been plainly and satisfactorily accepted by any of the Christian communions. In the two Catholic churches it has indeed in a certain sense been developed, but in a manner which has lead to the almost entire exclusion of the sermon, or at least the organic connection between the two has been lost sight of, and particularly has the real essence of the Lord's Supper been entirely discarded. The Greek-Catholic church converts the Lord's Supper into a spectacular display, into a mystical exhibition of holy secrets of faith, while the Roman church has converted it into a sacrifice, which, contrary to the evident purposes of the Lord in instituting it, does not assemble the congregation together, but is offered for them. In the Reformed church the effort has indeed been made to preserve for the Sacrament the feature of a celebration of the congregation, but the specific importance of the personal gracious presence of the Lord has not been retained. The Lutheran church, on the other hand, however zealously she has maintained the latter feature, has not in the same degree emphasized its value for the purposes of divine worship. The Lord's Supper is often in danger of becoming a private celebration for a few anxious souls, so that it is not understood as a congregational celebration. And yet the actual essence of public service finds its fullest expression first in the Lord's Supper, and only from this point does it become plain what means public worship stands in need of in order to fulfill its purpose.

From this standpoint we propose the question as to the importance of art for public worship; and to determine the importance art has in itself.

What is art? Is it only a superfluous decoration, with which arrogance seeks to make the necessities of life more agreeable and pleasant; is it the folly which to the detriment of the poor, seeks to please the senses of the rich and wealthy? Is art not the purely arbitrary gratification of a sensual desire, which, dissatisfied with the things as God has created them, seeks to give them shape and form according to its own imaginings? Certainly there is art which merely seeks to feed the passion for luxury, which fetters the thoughts and feelings of the human heart in order to chain these all the more to the world, and we can easily understand how at a certain period, the church could look upon art as something foreign to herself, since it appeared not to be consistent with the earnestness and unworldliness that should characterize the true Christian, and it seemed that the citizen of a future world should flee the art whose work it was to deck with gold the things of the present world. The poor and the lowly, who were the first to flock into the Christian church, were satisfied if they could only secure the necessities of life. How could they be expected to think, as did the children of this world, of that which served as an ornament and a decoration of life! And yet the artizan who employed his skill for others in order to beautify the things of this world, should he not also feel the necessity of ornamenting also those things which he made for the service of his God? And when at last the powerful of the world bowed low before the cross, would they not speak with David: "Behold, we dwell in houses of cedars and the ark of the Lord dwells in a tent." And

when Christians partake of the abundance of this world, should they not make use of this abundance to the honor of God? And does it not contrast remarkably with the selfishness and the carelessness of men in divine things, that the church of the Middle Ages was so zealous to honor God with its rich gifts, such as we enjoy now yet in so many noble examples of the church art of past centuries?

However, if we want to talk about art, it will not suffice to regard it merely as a certain ornamentation made according to a certain arbitrary feeling or inclination of man, concerning which it is bootless to dispute, or as merely a certain overflowing expression of man's feeling of pleasure. For is it really a purely accidental matter that man regards this or that object as beautiful? And has that luxurious life to which arrogance employs a claim also to be called art? Is any form or shape whatever, which men are pleased to give to an object an exhibition of art? Certainly we think of more than this when we speak of art. We know also of art which can prosper even without great external means, which needs not gold or silver or precious materials in order to find the proper expression. Art is indeed a free activity of human thought, a creative activity, in as far as such can be ascribed to a creature. But as the materials which art requires in order to do its work, have been given to man; just as he of himself is not able to make even an atom of dust; thus too is man bound by laws and models which he must follow if he would be an artist in truth, namely not only the general laws of nature, as these are discovered and described by science, but still more the idea or ideas of nature which cannot be unearthed with levers and other mechanical appliances, but which the eye of the artist detects simply because he is an artist. And not only the

idea of the nature without us, but also the idea of the spiritual life of the human heart, as also the idea of history —there too is the artist bound to observe.

In truth the idea of nature, the idea of this terrestrial world it is which seeks to find expression in art. For this world is not as it should be; it contradicts not only the wishes and needs of the human race, but also the purpose which the open eye can detect in it. The same eye that perceives in the works of God in nature His eternal power and divinity, sees also the longings of this creature for freedom, sees the servile condition of this divine creation under the power of corruption. In the midst of the harmony of nature we find much disharmony. What a problem! And when that same Apostle, who looks upon nature from this standpoint, prayerfully recognizes the depth and the riches of the ways of God toward mankind, are these not again ways that are past finding out, judgments that cannot be comprehended? And just in these contradictions art finds its motive. Over against this world so full of contradictions, it builds up the ideal world, in which those purposes and those laws of which it has a presentiment as existing in this terrestrial nature and world, come with full and unhindered force, whether it be that it excites the heart to a pure joy, by describing this ideal world as one in which that which ought to be can without difficulty be secured; or be it that it agitates the heart by showing the tragical feature that out of this contest and contradiction, this ideal, this power that should prevail, can gain the victory only by the destruction of this outward form; or be it, that, as a comedy, it calls forth smiles, when it depicts the contradiction to the idea as the vain force which in the end always destroys itself. Of course this world which art builds up is indeed not a real,

visible world; it is a world whose reality is only a seeming one; art is pure appearance (Schein). It may be able to deceive man for a moment with this world of appearances so that he does not notice the weaknesses of the real world, but it cannot lead him into a really ideal world.

In so far as art clothes this idea of this actual world with the appearance of reality, it is of course bound to the general laws that control the universe. When it emancipates itself without reason from these, it becomes fantastic and loses its character as genuine art.

The last and highest thoughts of God concerning this world, which in the end are the same as the ethical laws, in whose service the world-order stands, of course do not in all stages of the world's existence show themselves plainly. Since art grasps this world in its highest idea as the perfect hand-maid of man and as unconditionally serving the purpose of man, it of course cannot ignore the fact that man himself is also bound to a moral idea, and it would exhibit a tendency in contradiction to its real nature, if it would attempt everywhere to grasp these last and highest ideas immediately. But the point where art, without detriment to these highest ideas can no longer disregard them, is often enough near to that point where the regard for these ideas must appear as strained and in poor taste. Unawares mistakes are sometimes made by which art forgets its purpose and it becomes that false guide, which, instead of seeking to lead man to the ideal world, entraps him to seek in this world the fountain where he shall quench his thirst. When it understands to avoid this error, and when it rubs the childlike eyes which it needs sees in the morally good the highest idea which has been implanted into this world, and thus builds up its world according to the ideals of the good, then it steps into an immediate relationship to the service of God.

As we saw before, it is a world of perfection into which the public worship of God seeks to elevate the congregation, a world which has been revealed in the Gospel, and which this worship is intended to impress anew upon the soul of

the Christian so easily discouraged in this imperfect world, a world in which the power of vanity is to be broken and the thoughts of God shall find expression without let or hindrance. It is the most powerful tragedy of the world's history which forms the basis of Christianity and the centre of Christian worship. And when Christianity proclaims God as one who in His councils is as much exalted over all the efforts of human wisdom as in the absoluteness of His power over all the boasted strength of human and earthly forces, it arouses perhaps in the heart of the Christian a sentiment similar to that at which a certain class of poetry aims.

It might then seem that religion also is a part of poetry, a poem of the soul, which in its imagination has built up above the world of reality a higher world of perfection. And yet there is a decided line of demarcation separating the Christian religion from art. It is a *real and true* world of the ideal which the former reveals and claims to realize on this earth. Christianity is not content if those, to whom it addresses itself, for a moment forget their personal sufferings and those of the world, and that then the waves of these sufferings break in again in their former fury; but just as Christianity seeks to effect a total and thorough regeneration of the world, and offers a real healing for all the ills of the world, or in other words, seeks actually and really to save the world, thus too it wishes not to paint before our eyes merely the picture of an ideal world, but to lead the congregation to the actual participation in a real world, which extends over and above the present world; and for this reason and that this is to be done, deeper and more correct moral requisites must be demanded. Christianity does not wish to cover up the evils of this world and cause them to be forgotten for a moment, but rather to follow up these evils to their original source and heal them there. Christianity must not be regarded as child's play, but as a holy, genuine and earnest matter. Just in the act of worship, as we have seen, Christianity indeed endeavors to give a foretaste of this future perfection to which it wants to

lead the world, to raise the congregation above the world of every-day life, and here at least it seems to come into a closer contact with art. And, indeed, if Christianity does not wish entirely to reject the co-operation of art, or even will not do without it, if it sees in the incitement of an ideal feeling the help and the preparation for the fulfillment of its own ends, then it will open its doors to art especially in public worship; for it stands in need of just such an aid to bring near to the congregation the ideal world which it offers. Of course the Church, before it opens its doors to art, must state its conditions. Not as mistress but only as handmaid can art enter. Art dare not operate unrestrained in this ideal world. In its leading outlines the picture of this ideal world, to which the congregation is to be raised, has already been drawn by revelation. Art can only fill out these outlines. Its work is that of a servant in the service of the Lord, for that Christ with whom the congregation is in the house of worship to be united, has promised that He Himself will be present. The blessings which are to be offered are real blessings. Since art to a certain degree is to present to the senses of man also the godly mysteries, it does not fetter the eye and the ear to itself only, but must modestly again retire to the background in order to draw attention to the high and holy as something that is real and true.

The eternal, the true can of course not be represented to us otherwise than figuratively. The Lord is still compelled to speak to us in parables; and whenever He desires to be really present with us, He makes use of some figure (*Bild*) in which to envelop Himself. Only through a glass darkly do we look into the mirror of the future world. For this reason we need art. If it were the object of public worship merely to teach or to exhort, then we could well do without art or even banish it; then the danger might always be connected with its use of preventing the concentration of our thoughts, the study of ourselves, the earnest determination of the will; then it might be well to keep before our minds the chasm between our actual state and that in

which we ought to be, and to put aside all representations of the eternal by pictures and sounds of the present world. If the object were only to pray or to offer sacrifice, then man could offer to his God whatever art furnishes, whether it is conceived in a religious spirit or not, in order to separate himself from that to which his heart wants to cling. But if in the Christian service the reception of spiritual blessings, the transfer into a higher sphere, is the characteristic feature, then art must be employed principally for the purpose of representing this. Therefore, even if art is a handmaid that cannot be dispensed with, she must nevertheless remain a handmaid who seeks not to shine by her own virtues or seek to edify with her own means.

In view of the connection between public service and art and in the similarity of the effects at which both aim, it is easily understood why attempts have been made to supplant Christianity by art or to make Christianity a product of the imagination which was to have no higher value than any other creation of the imagination, and that the technical terms of public worship have been employed to describe the effects of art, as e. g. "The great Richard Wagner congregation is celebrating its festivals at Bayreuth and is seeking edification in the temple of Wagner's muse in the outpourings of his spirit." But the greater the danger of confounding public worship and the pleasures of art, the more is it necessary that in public worship art be kept within the bounds of a servant, and that our churches do not become concert halls and our houses of worship museums of art. How the indispensable assistance of art in public service is to be kept within proper limits, can be determined only by a consideration of the different arts and their importance for public service.

The acknowledgment that public worship needs art and the willingness to open the doors of the house of God to art, does not make superfluous the question, if then every single species of art thereby secures a right in the church and whether all the kinds of art, which show themselves as admissible, may have in the same measure and

degree their work to do in the church. These questions cannot be answered in the affirmative. Not every art has an equal connection with public service; not every art has an equal right with others to be employed for this purpose.

Two arts there are which in a prominent sense are a necessity to public worship, namely, architecture and music. Both stand in a close inner connection to each other. Measure and number, according to which our God has ordained all His works, are employed prominently in these two arts. It is not the unrestrained freedom of creative imagination which rules supreme in these arts; symmetry and harmony of measure here conditions the impression of beauty. The well known words of L. Tieck, who said that architecture is "frozen music," tersely shows the connection between the two. And for public service also the two have an analogous importance. As the house of God outwardly gathers and holds the congregation, thus the music also, from the sound of the bell which proclaims in the midst of the outer world the thought of eternity, to the sound of the organ and the hymn of the congregation, which hold the congregation together inwardly and subjectively. As architecture is the condition and foundation for the utilization of the plastic arts, thus too music is the basis for the oratorical arts. And to the differences between architecture and music corresponds the fact that the plastic arts are used to depict rather the objective, or, as we might say, the sacramental blessings, i. e. the divine thoughts and the divine blessings, and to present these to the eyes of the congregation by whom they are to be used, and that the oratorical arts are rather used to express and to excite the feelings and the thoughts when these gifts are received. Of course this cannot be regarded as a distinction that can on all occasions be made. The divine Word, being a means of grace, is used for the one part of public worship as well as for the other. But it is the natural order that we should begin with the question concerning the sacramental part of public worship, and therefore with the question as to the measure and the kind of the right of the plastic arts.

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.

AUGUST, 1887.

No. 4.

THE WORD WE PREACH.

To the seventy sent by Christ to proclaim the nearness of God's kingdom, He gave "the working of miracles" in order that with signs following them He might confirm the words of their preaching. Whether or not they were qualified as were the twelve who, as they spake in the name of the Lord, received both the form and substance of divine truth, of that we are not informed. Yet to the seventy no less than to the twelve, the Lord gave the assurance: "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth Him that sent me." Luke 10, 16. Lacking, as we do, the extraordinary gifts bestowed on the seventy and on the twelve, do the words addressed to them also apply to us who at the present time are called to the ministry of the Word? If they were spoken in view of the extraordinary qualifications referred to, then do they not apply to us, at least not with equal force; for we are not so qualified. Still there can be no doubt but what the Lord will have us so to preach that He may say also to us: He that heareth you, heareth me. True, we have not the gift of inspiration, and we are not infallible; but we do have the infallible Word of inspiration, and the gift of the Spirit who leads into all truth; and

besides, we have the divine call to preach that Word, and to preach it without adding thereto or taking away from it. From these facts we derive the assurance, first, that it is the will of our Master that the truth we proclaim be the truth He has given us, nothing more and nothing less; and secondly, that it is made possible for us so to preach that they who shall hear us shall hear our Lord. In what measure this will and working of the Lord are then realized in our ministry depends, of course, on the degree of faithfulness in which we heed the one and submit to the gracious influence of the other. But again, the fact that we are liable to error and that we do make mistakes sometimes, does not disprove the rule that they who hear us His servants hear God Himself. By this fact the application of the rule is limited however, so that care is necessary on the part of those who apply it lest they be led astray; like their fellow Christians at Berea they are to receive the Word with all readiness of mind, but at the same time diligently search the Scriptures to learn whether what is preached them is truly the Word of God.

The assurance of the Lord, He that heareth you, heareth me, is, first of all, a word of most precious promise and of sweetest comfort. So near will Christ bring us to Himself, so completely will He be in us, so thoroughly will He equip us, and so entirely will He take us into His service, that He may say to us: He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me, and Him that sent me. But while we comfort ourselves with this promise and with the assurance that the Lord Himself will see to its fulfillment, let us not for a moment become insensible of the overwhelming responsibility thus imposed on us, nor lose sight of the fact that we on our part may do much to hinder this will of the Lord toward us. It is a most dreadful sin

to teach for the Word of God our own words or the words of men. There can be no greater sin, than that of misrepresenting our Lord and of deceiving souls that would at our hands receive the counsel of God to their salvation. Hence, such admonitions as these: "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine. Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee in prophecy, with the laying on of hands by the presbytery. Meditate upon these things; give thyself wholly to them; that thy profiting may appear to all. Take heed unto thyself and the doctrine; continue in them; for in doing this thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee." 1 Tim. 4, 13-16. "He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord." Jer. 23, 28. "Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth. 2 Tim. 2, 15.

That we ourselves *believe* and believe *the Word*, this is among the subjective elements entering into our preaching, the fundamental and all-controlling one. A mere knowledge of the truth may enable us to be preachers to it; but witnesses of it, as we should be, we become only through the faith which is by the operation of God. We should therefore above all things pray for this gift, and for a continued increase of it, to the end that for ourselves it may be the means of apprehending the manifold grace of God, and that with reference to others it may be a power of God in us operating to bring the grace received to them also. The faith that saves us it at the same time the faith that worketh by love for the salvation of others. It follows then that in our study of the Word we should learn from it and draw from it with a view both of believing and of preaching it.

Our use of the Word as believers for ourselves and our use of it as believers and preachers to others, however much the one may and always should involve the other, are nevertheless two distinguishable acts. In our use of it for ourselves, for example, we draw from it with special reference to our own needs; while in our use of it for others we consult it and gather from it for the special purpose of meeting the wants of our hearers. So again, while in our former contemplation of it we may yield ourselves wholly to its gracious influences and do so without thought of anything except of that which is before us, we must in its latter use, ask ourselves all along how we may expound and convey to others such truths as present themselves to us. Moreover, as preachers we shall do well if we inquire of the Word itself not only what we are to bring to our hearers but also how we may rightly bring it to them. The Bible, indeed, is neither a book of sermons nor a dissertation on homiletics; but yet it is full of the richest information also in this respect. As with regard to the material of our preaching it is the only book, so with regard to the form of our preaching it may be said to be the best among all books. Take the Gospels for example: they are not a series of formal propositions, they do not constitute a learned and logical treatise according to our way of thinking, they are not given in the style of a modern sermon or in the fashion of some text-book but they are largely transmitted to us in the shape in which the Lord Himself preached the truths they contain to His hearers. The same holds true to a great extent with regard to the words of the prophets and apostles. Now confident as we are that He who is Himself the Truth is at the same time the one who knows best how to teach it, it follows that we should never cease to learn of Jesus how to preach. "A

word fitly spoken—says Solomon—is like apples of gold in pitchers of silver.” Hence, while we go to the Scriptures for the pure gold of doctrine, we should not neglect to bring with us of the silver of speech, in which, as in vessels becoming the heavenly treasure, this is presented to us and we again may present it to others.

To the end that we in our own language and in language adapted to the capacity of our hearers may so preach the Word that they who hear us may understandingly hear the Lord, an acquaintance on our part with the general characteristics of the Scripture will be found very serviceable. This will help us not only in the interpretation of the particular text but in determining to what use it may be put, how it may be applied, to what auxiliaries we may have recourse; in short, it will clear and widen our vision generally in furtherance of good preaching. God who is perfect in all things, is certainly the perfect preacher also; and hence it is safe to say that as preachers, too, we are to be “followers of God.” And just here we should, among other things, remember that what God in this respect has cleansed, men are not to call common; and that what he is pleased to sanctify and exalt, is by us not to be despised.

On account of our early and gradual introduction to the books of the Bible, it may have escaped our notice; but it is a striking fact nevertheless that the Scriptures deal very extensively with the many little things of this earth and with the affairs of this present life. The multiplicity and variety of things profane we find introduced there, are simply marvelous. This is certainly contrary to every human preconception of a book having God for its author. The fact is that on account of this very feature offense is taken by some, and that they urge it as an argument

against the inspiration of the good book. Now while on the one hand we should beware of this folly and teach our people to beware of it, on the other hand the question arises, What may we as preachers learn from this divine example? To answer: learn from it how God would have us view and use the world, is perfectly correct; and this is the chief lesson; but another is, that no creature of God and its doings are to be considered too small or too far removed to find a place in the sermon. The only question is: where, how and to what end? And this too we can learn from God's own way of drawing into use the things of earth and the doings of men for purposes of instruction.

And here it should be noticed in the first place that while the Scriptures speak of things great and small, good and bad, high and low, infinite and finite, they invariably do so in the most concrete and practical manner. Much as the alwise God has to say of time and space, matter and spirit, body and soul, of things and of the knowledge of things,—not once does He speak of them except in their relation be it to Himself and His will and purpose, or to men and the lives of men in their relation to God and themselves. Abstract speculations find no place in the Scriptures. Speaking of God they speak of Him inclusive of the entire fulness of some one or other of His attributes, and what in such fulness He is and will be to the world and to things in the world. Whatever is said of events and things in heaven or in earth, invariably has reference to their moral or religious side, and is intended to illustrate or to convey such facts and truths as are of value to the souls of men and tend to the glory of God. "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the

man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." 2 Tim. 3, 16. This is characteristic of the entire Word, and of its every utterance; and, miraculous inspiration excepted, this should characterize also all our preaching of the Word. We too, then, may talk of the flowers and their beauty, of the birds and their songs, of the beasts and their burden, and of a thousand other things, only that we do so as followers of God or after the manner of God. It should be done for a purpose lying within the scope of preaching, and be so done as to serve that purpose. Wherever known events and familiar things are introduced to illustrate heavenly truths, care must be had lest the earthly become the object and the heavenly a mere pretext. It is a sad thing when the fact is made to serve the figure, and when the material is subordinated to the form; for within the sphere of preaching this is an exaltation of the earthly and human above the divine, and hence a leading of the soul away from God to earth and to self, and thus to destruction.

To conform our preaching to the Word in its homiletical aspect, and to be able to put to their intended use the manifold riches of its many lessons, it is especially necessary that we keep in view the unity of its essence and purpose. Divers and various as its materials are, and however variegated its complexion may on that account appear to us, there is in the Word of Scripture a common element which binds together all its parts into one Mosaic whole, so that the most perfect order and harmony prevail throughout. Its centre and its sum and substance is Christ; and its every part, even the most remote, points Christ-ward. "For it pleased the Father that in Him, who is the image of the invisible God, should all fulness dwell." As of

everything in heaven and in earth, so is He the Alpha and Omega, the Beginning and the End, the First and the Last, also of the holy Scriptures. He is the Way, the Truth, and the Life; and all who will must come to the Father by Him. Now since our preaching it can lawfully be no other in substance and in purpose than what are the substance and the purpose of the Word itself, it is evident that every passage of Scripture should be considered by us in its relation to Christ, and be employed to lead souls to Him. We may be sure that whatever portion of it is not in one way or another used by us to this end, is abused in its use.

This centralizing force of the Word is, however, a double one: the one pushing and the other drawing Christward. The one is the Law, the other is the Gospel. About these two all its other forces may be grouped; so that whatever be the statement of the Bible before us, its moral and religious import is either a legal or an evangelical one; primarily at least and in itself, and therefore also in its proper use, it either pushes us forward to Christ or it draws us on toward Him, and through Him to God. The fact, however, that both the Law and the Gospel make for Christ, each in a way its own, should on no account lead us into the fatal error of supposing that, in the work of converting the soul, the one or the other may be by itself sufficient. While the Law, for example, prepares men for Christ and leads them up to Him, yet does it of itself know nothing of Christ; it neither has Christ, nor can it put any one in possession of Him. It convinces of sin, brings its curse to bear, and shows the need of a Savior; but whether there is a Savior of sinners, and if, who that may be—these and similar questions the Law can not answer. To do this is exclusively the office of the Gospel; and by the revelation,

gifts and powers of this and of this alone, is the soul saved. But the Gospel, to do its work, needs the preliminary and preparatory work of the Law, in order that it may accomplish the purpose of its giving; so that to the saving of souls by preaching, the preaching of both the Law and the Gospel is necessary.

When now the Scriptures enjoin on us to preach "rightly dividing the Word," this undoubtedly means that we are to distinguish well between Law and Gospel; and the distinction made, that we distribute the several truths of Scripture assigning to each such a place and so much of space as by right belong to it. Then, having done this for ourselves, that we preach it accordingly; that is, preach the Law as Law and the Gospel as Gospel; linking them indeed, and linking them in good order and in proportionate measure, but yet never mixing them. But in connection with this the condition of our hearers must also be consulted, if we would rightly divide the Word and so do the work of our ministry wisely; for while everybody, whether he be with Christ or without Christ, has need of the entire Word, yet does the one stand in need of the Gospel more than of the Law, whilst with another hearer the reverse may be the case. This even holds true as to whole congregations. A right division of the Word when preached implies a right division in view of the needs of the hearers.

The Word we preach is the Word of God. To make us conscientious and faithful in its delivery to men, this fact, more than any other, needs to be kept in view and be allowed to bind our consciences. This Word committed to us, how inexhaustible is the wisdom, how tremendous the power, and how costly the treasure, that are thus placed into our hands as its ministers and stewards.

As regards the commandments which we declare to men, the great God Himself is both the Lawgiver and Lawyer, the Juror and the Judge, all in one. His will is perfect, and it is absolute and supreme. He is His own interpreter, and He is infallible in all His judgments. He is the Searcher of hearts and nothing is hidden from His sight. His arm is almighty, it extends over all the works of His hands, and no one is able to escape from the evil that He is determined to inflict. Now in the exercise of these His prerogatives we ministers are made His agents. "Thus saith the Lord!" on this foundation we stand, with this authority are we clothed and do we come to men. It may and it should sadden our hearts when people reject the Word of command we bring to them; but we should never forget, nor fail to tell them also, that the Word we declare is not ours but the Lord's, and that if they are offended at what we say their quarrel is not with us but with the great God whom we serve. Our concern is, that with reference to our God we be humble, willing and faithful; with reference to men, that we be loving, fearless and bold.

As through the Law, so through the Gospel it is God who deals with them that hear it from our lips. It is the power of God unto salvation to all them that believe it. And a power how gracious and rich! The Gospel is throughout either the bestowal or the promise of good things, of the good things of God's merciful love. It is a letter of adoption into His own household; a continuous stream of love that regenerates and sanctifies for life in the presence of God; it is a deed to a mansion in the Father's house, signed with the blood of His own dear Son, and sealed by the true Witness of the Spirit. To all this gracious operation of God among men, we are the agents, and of all the riches con-

veyed we are the bearers. Mark then the importance and the dignity of the office, and the tremendous responsibility resting on those to whom it is committed. It is true that every positive saving effect is entirely of God and by His Word; but all the more must it be our concern that this Word be preached, and that we so preach it as in no way to hinder but in every way to serve the coming of God to men and His communication with them.

Salvation is by the Word; they who reject it remain in their sins and die a death eternal; but all who accept it have what it conveys, everlasting life with God. To this Word we are ministers; and if faithful ministers, then can we say with Paul: "Now thanks be to God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of His knowledge by us in every place. For we are unto God a sweet savor of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish: To the one we are the savor of death unto death; and to the other the savor of life unto life. And who is sufficient for these things? For we are not as many, which corrupt the Word of God: but as of sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God speak we in Christ." 2 Cor. 2, 14-17. The Lord increase our faith, that in our service of Him we may be found faithful.

C. H. L. S.

AMBITION.

Address before the Literary Societies of Capital University June 28, 1887, by Rev. O. S. Oglesby of Lithopolis, O., and published by request.

To the average mind oblivion is an abyss filled with horrors, and the desire to be rescued from the dreaded dark-

ness of forgetfulness glows with greater or less fervency in the heart of almost every representative of the human family. When this desire becomes so strong that it seeks and finds expression in words and actions, it is at once recognized, by all except its possessor, as *ambition*.

Respecting this emotion of the soul, which aspires to that which lies beyond its present condition and possession, a two-fold mistake is frequently made, since it is regarded by some as an unimportant, ineffectual longing, and by others as something necessarily sinful.

Even the illustrious genius Shakspeare declared, "I hold ambition of so airy and light a quality that it is but a shadow's shadow."

But ambition is far from being of such an airy and ineffectual character, nor is it necessarily sinful. With millions ambition proves the very strongest incentive to action, moving many men to deeds of extraordinary daring, when all other motives would leave the heart and hands inert.

When the object is simply the advancement of self, to enjoy the bliss of fame, the applause of men, it is selfish and sinful, and inevitably ends in disappointment and sorrow. This is *ambition*, but *ambition culpable*.

But ambition is not always of this selfish, sinful character. There are men who do not always look upon their own interests, or to self only, but also to the interests of others. Men who desire to be something, and even something great, to have power and influence, not for the sake of self, but for the sake of others, their brethren, and especially for the sake of One, their Master, Christ. *This is ambition, but ambition laudable.* Southern expresses this thought in the words:

"Ambition is an idol, on whose wings
Great minds are carried only to extremes:
To be sublimely great, or to be nothing."

These two features of ambition we will try to present, and according to the common rule of dismissing first that which is most unpleasant, we will discuss in the first place

AMBITION CULPABLE.

When ambition has simply self for its object it is mere idolatry, the deifying of self. Neither the age in which it manifests itself, the field in which it operates, nor the external character of its achievements can free it from the charge of *culpability*, so long as its only object is the advancement of self, regardless of the rights of others. While ambition, true to its nature, seeks to inhabit the hearts of the wise, noble, mighty and experienced of earth, and strives for the accomplishment of illustrious achievements, it does not scorn to take up its abode in humbler habitations, and content itself with deeds, even ignoble and base, if it can but win the applause of men thereby.

This selfish, culpable ambition is a spirit which seeks, and too often finds, the hearts of kings, rulers, conquerors, and scholars for its home, and strives to direct the actions, and control the destiny of nations, yea, of the world; and history shows us how successful it has been in this field, and vainly tries to describe the crimes it has perpetrated, the sorrow it has caused.

But whether successful or unsuccessful in its efforts to subjugate the mighty of earth, and in inscribing its fame indelibly upon the history of the world by deeds astounding in their character, it still seeks to occupy the hearts of the humbler members of the human family, and to control

their words and actions, even though the notoriety gained may be of the dimest and most doubtful character, and ever so limited in its circle. As Satan essayed to conquer Christ, the only perfect man, and does not fail, wherever possible, to lead captive the humblest son or daughter of Adam, so ambition tries to capture the hearts of earth's mightiest men, and does not fail to rule, if possible, in the hearts of the ignorant and the brutal.

The theologian, the physician, the lawyer, the politician, the student, the merchant, the mechanic, the soldier, the prize-fighter, the glutton, the bond and the free, male and female, are all subject to the allurements of ambition, and it is quite possible for men and women in each and every field of human activity, and in every station and condition of life, to be actuated by the spirit of selfish ambition, and to have pleasure in the publicity of their deeds whatever their sphere or character.

Whether ambition is culpable or not does not depend upon the external character of its achievements, but upon the motive by which men are prompted to them. The theologian who strives with zeal to preach the Gospel of Christ with enticing words and in eloquent strains, who strives to win souls for the kingdom of heaven, but does this *because* he holds it to be the best means of exalting himself before men, of winning a name and fame among men;—the philanthropist who gives millions for schools and asylums, who gives all his goods to feed the poor, but does this because he deems it the best method of erecting a monument of glory to his own name;—the student who prays that the days may be lengthened that he may have the more time to acquire knowledge, and as if to seize by force the answer to his own prayer, trims the midnight

lamp, that its increased brilliancy may avail for his own wasted and waning strength, *because* he desires to possess the power to exalt himself above his fellow students: are all alike slaves of culpable ambition, and differ only in the ways they take to reach the same point. This culpable ambition is simply an "*Ignis fatuus*" which inevitably dooms its devotees to disappointment. The dreams of selfish ambition are as certain of non-fulfillment as are the dreams arising from a disordered stomach. The happiness which selfish ambition promises is never realized.

Men will scale the mountain heights, will brave the fury of the stormy deep, will face the cannon's fiery mouth, the musket's deadly roar, and the saber's lightning gleam, will sacrifice parents and home, wife and children, body and soul, will traverse land and sea in their heedless chase after the bright-winged phantom with which ambition allures them, and when they have grasped it, if they grasp it at all, it shrinks to nothing in the grasp, and leaves only a sting and a stain, a sting of conscience and a stain of character. The history of the world is literally composed of records illustrating and proving our assertion. The inspired writings furnish us many instances in which mortals, highly favored, were deluded and destroyed by the imaginary god of unholy ambition. We will merely mention the names of a few prominent upon this roll, such as Aaron and Miriam, Korah, Dathan, Abiram and Absalom, Herod, the murderer of the innocent, and Ananias and Sapphira.

But it is in the realms of profane history that we gain the most appalling view of the ruins wrought by the cruel tyrant, culpable ambition. We can not engage, on this occasion, to show you over this entire field. You would weary with the journey and sadden with the sight. But standing

anywhere in this vast field, we can point you to a few monuments of foolish ambition which tower above all the others.

Away back, in the misty past, we see one upon which we read this inscription;—Alexander the Great, who as a boy exclaimed, “My father will leave nothing for me to do,” and who, as a man conquered the world, and wept because there were no other worlds for him to conquer, this same Alexander died an ignominious death, the victim of his own foolish ambition.

Much nearer we see another stately ruin upon whose wall we plainly read: “Napoleon I., supreme in counsel, mighty in war, determined to perpetuate his kingdom, even though God denied him an heir to his throne, for the sin of deifying self, and of putting away his loving and faithful wife, Josephine, was overthrown by God, and died in miserable exile upon the lonely isle of St. Helena.”

Close by this we find another and a most revolting ruin, wrought not merely by *culpable*, but by *brutish* ambition, upon which we cannot bear to look longer than to read the names, Danton, Robespierre and Murat, the detestable triumvirate which instigated and directed the French Revolution of 1787-97, justly designated the “Reign of Terror.”

Near at hand we find still another monument marking the place in the estimation of men, of a man of giant intellect, but who is classed among those who failed, because he was more ambitious to gain the praise and friendship of men, than the love and approbation of God; one who had not the force of character to enable him to stand by the principles which he knew to be right—Erasmus. History proves our assertion, that *culpable ambition* knows but one result, disappointment. This *culpable ambition* never looks

back upon the havoc it has wrought; it is deaf alike to the pleadings of conscience and the voice of reason; like a torrent it overrides every gentler emotion of the soul as it rushes on in its mad course; and it scruples not to violate nature's most sacred laws and holiest ties.

To this culpable ambition Lilly refers, in the couplet—"Ambition has but two steps; the lowest, blood; the highest, envy," and Shakspeare in the line—"By that sin fell the angels." Oh, the countless numbers of those who have realized the words of Brown:—

"O false ambition !
Thou lying phantom ! Whither hast thou lured me !
Ev'n to this giddy height, where now I stand
Forsaken, comfortless; with not a friend
In whom my soul can trust."

But in this respect men will seldom learn by the experience of others. To-day, thoughtless thousands choose the road, and thoughtless thousands will continue to choose the road which thoughtless thousands have already chosen to ruin and to death.

But there is in the second place a pleasanter feature of this subject which we have promised to discuss, and for convenience we designate it as

AMBITION LAUDABLE.

There is an ambition which has an infinitely higher, wiser, mightier and nobler deity than self, one which turns away from self and chooses the great high God as the object of its adoration and as the subject of its service. There are those whose one desire, whose ambition is to be instruments in the hands of God for the accomplishment of His will,

and for the promotion of his honor. In this men may become truly great, become true benefactors of our race, the beloved and applauded of men, may inscribe their names and fame indelibly upon the scroll of history, may direct the thought and determine the course and destiny of countless generations, and to aim at this is not selfishness in disguise, but it is an ambition, ambition that is laudable.

There is an ambition which has a higher and holier aim than simply to become the admired monarch in the realms of literature, or science, than to be merely the lauded leader of senates, or the conqueror of nations. It is an ambition to be the adopted son of the One great King of the Universe, to be robed in the royal apparel in which He clothes those whom He loves to honor, to serve Him faithfully in our calling, and by faithfully serving Him, most effectually and nobly serve our fellow-men. To be this is to be *truly* and *eternally* great, and to desire this is ambition, but ambition that is laudable, an ambition which should be ours.

This laudable ambition is the one inspiration, the one great motive which prompts all truly great men to action. Labor prompted by this desire furnishes the only reliable foundation for true and permanent fame. As we have already shown, those who by self-worship and self-service gain worldly honor, yea, though they, for a season, stand upon the very pinnacle of worldly glory, they never derive the coveted happiness from their unjust acquisitions; and beneath the penetrating rays of just inquiry and criticism their fame vanishes as the dew beneath the morning rays of the midsummer sun, and in a few years their fame is spoken only in the mumbling tones of indifference and curiosity.

But it is not so with those who are actuated by laudable ambition. They are never disappointed in their expected

pleasure. Sowing to the spirit, they inevitably reap the fruits of the spirit, joy and peace; and their joy is full, and no man taketh it from them, and their peace is not as the world giveth, ephemeral, but abiding. They furnish an undeniable answer to the question of Cowley.

“What shall I do to be forever known,
And make the age to come my own?”

If this laudable ambition is the main-spring of any man's exertions, then let him be as ambitious as he will. The more of this ambition he has the better it will be for himself, for his immediate associates, and for all who ever come within the radius of his influence. To all the students of this University, yea, to all the students of our land, in whose bosoms this laudable ambition has its abode, in whose hearts glows the desire to gain knowledge, and therefore power, to be used for the glory of God, and the good of man, to all such we would address the words which Willis once addressed to the students of Yale College,

“Press on! for it is godlike to unlose
The spirit, and forget yourself in thought;
Bending a pinion for the deeper sky,
And, in the very fetters of your flesh,
Mating with the pure essences of heaven!
Press on!—‘for in the grave there is no work
And no device.’—Press on! while yet you may!”

This laudable ambition is not confined to one rank or profession only, but is, and should be, found among men of every station and profession in life.

The desire to be a true child of God, and to serve Him faithfully may dwell in the heart of either the humbler or the exalted of earth. This desire may glow with like fervency in the heart of the humblest laborer or of the mighti-

est ruler, and wherever it exists, it is enabled by the same power, the grace of God, to gain its object, to win its crown.

The thought is frequently entertained that ambition unfits men for many professions in life, and renders success impossible. But the parentage of the thought is easily traceable to the father of lies, and it never finds place in the mind of a truly thoughtful man. Both history and personal observation enable us to point to men in every walk of life whose only spur to action, whose guiding star was *laudable ambition*, who, nevertheless, have been eminently successful, and have become permanently famous.

As such instances I would mention among statesmen George Washington, who buried self, as it were, and made the interests of the people of the American Colonies the object of his life; Henry Clay, who declared, "I would rather be right, than be president;" Charles Sumner, and Abraham Lincoln who devoted their time, talents, blood and life to gain for the black men of this land the rights which God in their creation designed them to enjoy, which the Declaration of Independence accorded them, and the Constitution of the United States in principle guaranteed them, but which cruel and ungodly men had denied them. Among warriors I could point you to David who, as a mere youth, went forth in the name of God to fight the battles of God; during a long life, wholly spent as a warrior, victory never forsook his banner; a man eminently successful, and a name immortal. And still another, Gustavus Adolphus, Sweden's noblest king, who, with his army and treasures, hastened to the defense of Christianity in an hour of threatening darkness, and though he lost his life, he liberated Christianity from her exulting enemies, and won for himself an undying name.

Among the theologians we will mention but two, the Apostle Paul, and Martin Luther. Their histories are known, their success is acknowledged, and their fame is as wide as the world and as enduring as time; to-day their labors bless the millions, their thoughts direct the millions.

This laudable ambition robs no man of the hope of success, but alone gives him worthy promises of being truly successful. It unfits him for nothing except that which is base, but fits him for everything that is noble. To serve God, and by this service truly to promote the real interests of our fellow-men, and to excel in this service whatever our calling may be, let this be our highest aim, our only ambition. This being the motive of our actions, the aim of our lives, the desire of our hearts,

Onward, onward may we press
In the path of duty,
In excellence our happiness
In faithfulness our glory.

ART IN PUBLIC WORSHIP.

From the German by Professor H. Schmidt, of Breslau.

(SECOND ARTICLE.)

A. THE PLASTIC ARTS.*

It is a natural thought that man, in constructing a building which is to serve as a place of protection for his labor or for recreation, should seek to give it a form which in itself will characterize it as such, and, as it were, declare

*Tr. by G. H. S.

its purpose. Architecture becomes an art and accomplishes its end in the same measure as it is able to attain in a characteristic manner the object that controls all the particular features. And since no structure can have a higher and more important purpose than the one which is to serve the religious ends of man, architecture has accordingly developed its highest qualifications in buildings devoted to religious purposes. When Christianity entered the world, and managed to secure a firm basis in it, it was all the more necessary that in its church structures it should be distinguished from the extra-Christian religions, since the aims of Christianity from the very beginning were entirely different from any of which the Gentile world had dreamed. The latter built for their divinities temples and abodes in which these were to dwell; even the altar upon which the people sacrificed was often not placed in the sanctuary at all in which the god had come to dwell. But God does not dwell in temples made with hands. The presence of His grace is connected with the assembling of the congregation. The sacred building must be a house for the congregation, must be a "church" or assembly place for the people.

We are not writing a history of architecture at this place. We therefore have nothing to do with the question of the beginnings of Christian art. Just as the Church herself at a very early date was separated into two channels, thus, too, the same difference of spirit made itself felt in the church architecture of the old world.

In the East the so-called "central structure" became more and more the characteristic feature, i. e. that over against the square or cubic space in the centre of the building, and all the other parts were added round about as subordinate in importance. By means of a high cupolo, this

central part was distinguished from all the rest, which latter in the course of time were marked by small cupulos; and in this manner the well known five-cupulo form originated which has become the distinguishing characteristic of the oriental churches. The purpose of this form will become evident when we remember that this style of structure really excludes the possibility of all motion. The congregation, assembled in this central sanctuary, can have no other object but to look upward with the eye of worship directed to the opening in the cupulo, through which alone the light enters. This form seems perfectly suitable for a congregation which in its service of fixed formulas is to receive and to revere a supernatural revelation. The space around the altar does not appear as the aim of a movement on the part of the congregation and to be designated as such by the structure itself, but rather as a special holy place, separated from the space intended for the congregation; which object is especially evident when this space is actually closed to the audience by a so-called "Iconostas," or wall of images, in such a manner, that the congregation is able to see the altar space only through the doors that open in this wall. In this case the altar space is analogous to the Holy of holies in the temple of Jerusalem. The God who has been revealed in Christ still remains for the congregation in such darkness as even in the highest expression of worship does not admit of a full and blessed communion with Him. If we add to this, that this whole form of central structure is adapted rather for a heathen temple, we see already from this form of church architecture in the eastern church the fact finding its expression, that the consciousness of the deep distinction between Christianity and pre-Christian religion has by no means been sufficiently

developed, that this Christianity has not yet been able to throw off the spell of pre-Christian conceptions. As this manner of building in itself excludes all life and movement and carries with it the feature of stiffness or rigidity (Starrheit), thus too this form has in the course of time not undergone any change. In steady monotony this form has repeated itself century after century, and the difference between the various church structures consists only in the size, the materials, and the decorations; just as the whole oriental church has been without any thorough going historical development for many centuries.

On the other hand, the Church of the West, from the very beginning, has been the Church of motion and of history. From that time on when the congregations were able, without any interference, to satisfy their churchly needs publicly, they built their churches after the so-called Basilica style. Already the fact that the basilica does not appear as a quadratic but as an oblong space, suggests the idea of motion; still more was this the case when this oblong space was in its length divided into three portions, a division which was made by means of two rows of columns or pillars and by the higher elevation of the middle part. But of greatest importance is this that there is an additional structure forming the termination of the central portion, the so-called apsis, which appears as the object toward which the other portions of the building incline or move forward, and upon which the eyes of the congregation are turned. Originally intended as the place for the clergy, the apsis was soon given up entirely to the altar. The altar or the communion table, or the place of worship, where the public services as the expression of complete communion with God as revealed in Christ finds its highest realization,

is rightly considered as the object toward which all worship as a living act should be directed (gottesdienstliche Bewegung). The congregation in its public worship prepares itself personally to meet its God at the altar. This movement toward the altar was still retained in the church structures even then when by the addition of two side elongations the form of a cross was introduced, as these additions were added to the "choir." In this manner we have in church architecture the form of a cross as we have it, while in the central structure of the oriental churches we have a cross in the form of two equal lengths crossing each other in the center.

The fundamental feature of the church architecture of the Western Church, in which the altar space is, so to say, the organizing principle, was retained in the Roman Catholic Church down to the period of the reformation, and after that time also essentially in the Lutheran Church, but not, after the manner of the Greek Church, in rigid imobility, but with a number of changes and modifications. Apart from the fact that it was a matter of choice whether cross sections should be added or not; apart from the question whether variety should be introduced by adding one or more towers or by the use of a cupulo over the cross section: it was possible to give to the horizontal wall above the pillars as it were a certain motion by means of arches, or it was possible to make columns out of pillars or a combination of pillars; the flat roof could be made arched; the rounded arch could be made a crossed arch; the side naves could again be divided or be made in the center as high as the central nave, etc. But with all these changes the oblong form with the "choir" or altar place remained as it were the goal toward which the whole church structure inclined.

This tradition was however broken through by the Reformed, in the first place, because, as was seen in a previous article, they from principle exclude the element of art out of public service entirely, and strive to exclude every thought of a full expression of the divine by a finite form; and, secondly, because, according to their conception of the holy Sacraments, they are not able to assign to the table of the Lord's Supper, if it is at all to have a permanent place in the church, a position so prominent. They were therefore compelled to discard the "choir" and with this the prevailing principle of church architecture. And when in our days voices of overzealous Lutherans are heard, demanding an entirely new architectural form for evangelical churches, it must not be forgotten, that a departure from the traditional fundamental form of the Occidental Church does not appear possible without a change in the Lutheran conception of the Sacraments, and that the aim really can be only to give a new and characteristic expression to this traditional fundamental form. But we will in the very outset not suppress the conviction that we consider this whole idea of a new church architecture as entirely utopian, and can explain it only on the ground of a deeprooted lack of clearness in regard to the conditions necessary for the growth of a new style of architecture.

As is well known, in the West a distinction is made between three styles of architecture, which followed one after the other down to the Reformation; namely, the old genuine Basilica style; secondly, the so-called Romantic style of the early middle ages; thirdly, the Gothic of the later middle ages. This is not the place to enter upon the characteristics distinguishing these three. Their origin was based upon the fact that the Church in those cen-

turies had absolute control of all public life. Only in such an age when the architect could secure no opportunities of equal attractions elsewhere, and when even the greatest abundance of material wealth was lavishly devoted to the erection of churches, can we speak of a peculiar architecture for church buildings. Just as soon as the erection of palaces for princes became the leading work of architecture and this was regarded as of equal importance with the erection of churches, architecture also became profaned; and when it endeavored to invent new forms for church structures, it intentionally or unintentionally transferred the forms of secular structures into church buildings. In the middle ages the peculiarities of the secular buildings, such as city halls, palaces, etc. in modified form reappear transferred to church architecture; in the days of the Renaissance and Rococo style the forms that appear in palaces, theatres, pleasure houses, etc. are seen also in the churches. How then could we expect that in a time, in which the erection of museums, public buildings, parliament houses, depots, exhibition halls, etc. is regarded as the highest aim of the architect's art, and in which the Church has been crowded out of her position as a central and controlling power in public life, a new style of church architecture should arise?

And, farther, these styles of church architecture did not originate in this way, that an architect sat down and received specific instructions as to the ideas which a new style of church buildings should realize. These styles did not at any particular moment of time make their appearance in a fixed and settled form; but here, if anywhere, we can apply the teachings of the doctrine of transmutation. Beginning with what already existed, and, on the

basis of practical or ideal reasons, adding thereto little by little, these styles were developed gradually and by degrees, and each individual architect, while preserving his full individuality, yet labored in harmony with the spirit of a particular school of thought which controlled all national tendencies of the times. How then could an architect in such a time as the present, when with his knowledge of history he adapts his work to this or that style according to pleasure, be able to invent something entirely new, and which would be more than an individual *mixtum compositum* made up from elements of different styles?

And, finally, these styles of architecture did not originate without a close connection with new constructive principles. The possibility of such new principles however, in so far as common judgment can see, seems to be exhausted, unless the forms which result from the application of glass and iron to immensely spanned halls, which in comparison to their size admit of a great diminution of wall as also of the number and size of pillars, is to be considered as a new constructive principle. However, whether the application of such new structural features to church buildings, which are to impress one with the highest solidity possible and are designed to shut off the congregation from the world without, is at all practical, is more than doubtful. We believe that we must call out to those who are waiting for a new style of architecture or who want to build an entirely new church, the words: *Lasciate ogni speranza*: Abandon every hope!

The Evangelical Church must decide whether and in how far she will make use of these modern known forms, since it has already been shown that, and why, the fundamental form of the Western Church must be retained, and

we do not hesitate to assert, that it is only natural that the Evangelical Church will continue the connection with that style which was dominant when she originated in Germany. The Evangelical Church, from the very outset, has always protested that she was aiming at the formation of a new Church. Her object was only to reform the Church; she did not seek to break with history, but wanted to cut off from the Church those elements that had in the course of time unlawfully attached themselves to her, and to ward off false elements that were seeking entrance. Yea, it might even be said that the struggle against a new formation of the Church was the cause for the origin of the Evangelical Church. The income derived from the sale of indulgences, which was the outward occasion for the reformatory movement, was really intended to be spent for the restoration and improvement of the St. Peter's Church in Rome; and in this same new structure the renaissance has endeavored to develop its greatest ideas most extravagantly in church architecture also. In the monster cupolo of this church, the Papal tiara was, so to say, to be set in stone, and the universal sway of the pope to be symbolized as the continuation of the imperial role of antiquity. It is the idea of a compulsory centralization of man under the sway of one absolute power which herein finds its expression, just as the renaissance in general marks the beginning of the preponderance of worldly interests over spiritual interests; thus too we can see in the Peter's dome in Rome a sign of the tendency of the papacy to establish its authority no longer on the old supports of religious faith, but upon specifically worldly and political combinations. Just the new-Roman, Jesuitic Catholicism, as this constituted itself by ridding itself of the evangelical elements that were yet active in it

during the Middle Ages, made use of a new style of church structures. Down to our present century the Romanists knew no better model for their churches than those great renaissance and rococo buildings, with their decorations in stucco and imitated marble, with their gilded ornamentations, and their hollow show, just as we see them in exactly the same peculiarities in the halls of Versailles and the palaces of the imitators of Louis XIV. It was only the Romantic style, as this had been chiefly developed in Evangelical circles, that awakened in the Roman Catholic Church again a taste for the older styles. Jesuitic Ultramontanism has the least claim of all others in the completion of the Cathedral of Cologne.

The Gothic is the specific style of the Germanic nations in its most beautiful development, the specifically German style. Even if this style has learned much from the Arabs of Spain and of Sicily, and has found its first development in the northern part of France, which however is thoroughly saturated with Germanic elements, yet in no other style has the national spirit of the Germans so well found its expression. In so far as the Evangelical Church is not ashamed to acknowledge its adherence to the particular spirit in which German nationality has conceived the one universal truth of Christianity, neither need she be ashamed of her adoption of the national style of architecture, and this all the more since it is not the spirit of the nation as such, but the spirit of the nation as regards its religious features that finds its expression in this style of architecture. There are especially two traits that must be regarded as characteristic in this style, namely the powerful tendency upward in a vertical direction and the individual development of the different parts or members of the struc-

ture. Already the tower is adapted to draw the heart upward; and unconsciously too the heart follows the columns in the Church as they rise up to the vaulted ceiling, which latter is often made to represent the starry heavens to the eyes. And as on the outside also each of the buttresses has its own individuality and in the different sections serves its own purpose, and yet remains a serving member of the whole structure, thus too in the inner part of the church the pillars are arranged in groups, each one of which for itself rises up to the vaulted ceiling or is even continued in this ceiling. Is this heaven searching idealism no less than its individualism not a characteristic picture of German and also of Evangelical piety? Does it not seem providential that in those cities and districts which first embraced the Gospel, such as Nuernberg, Magdeburg, Ulm, churches built in this style were the first to open their doors to the Gospel? The best portion of the church-inheritance which the Reformation received consisted in Gothic structures. If the German Evangelical Church would then erect its new church buildings after this model, she would only be true to her history, and such a return would be all the more justifiable, since in the world of religion the archaic and traditional have special rights. The feeling that in religion we have to do with eternal matters can only be awakened when the forms in which this religion is presented do not change with the fashions of the day. Even if every new church is open to the criticism passed by A. Knopp on the buildings erected by King Lewis I. in Munich, when he said: "King Lewis can indeed build fine churches, but he cannot make them old;" yet a new structure after an old model is always better than one erected in the latest style of the German or Italian Renaissance.

Of course the Evangelical Church did not find these churches which she inherited entirely suitable to her purposes. She was compelled to remove much rubbish out of these churches; many of them could be compared with a magnificent garment which had passed into the hands of a degenerate descendant and looked like a misfit on such a person. Even if she possessed the means, the Evangelical Church in the character she possesses at the time would not consider it necessary to build immense cathedrals to secure the admiration of the world by forests of buttresses and arches, such as encircle the Cathedral at Cologne. Then, can not this style of architecture, just as well as any other, give expression to its peculiar beauties in modest structures? Are there not a large number of smaller churches which are genuine pearls of the Gothic style? Or does this style bring with it for the Evangelical cultus or worship any special practical difficulties? There certainly is no lack of light, when the side windows are not stained or painted. Good acoustics are also found in many Gothic churches. The misfortune that some few persons sitting behind the pillars cannot see the preacher is not to be considered so great. But whatever disagreeable features may yet exist, these could certainly be more easily removed by study and improvement of the old model than by the vain groping after an entirely new system. Just as this style underwent peculiar modifications in the cities along the coasts of the East Sea, as compared with the styles in vogue inland in the South and West, thus we could hope for a certain modification of the style on the basis of the needs of the cultus.

At any rate it is a favorable feature for the Evangelical Church in this style that, without making the application

of the other plastic arts impossible, it does not require them. In this manner of building there are no bare walls which absolutely require the decorator's or artist's brush, no niches which demand the sculptor's handiwork; besides, this art indeed can even with its greatest productions scarcely claim a right of admission to this house. The cultus of the world of antiquity has sought its highest ideals in the images of the gods. In representing the Olympians the sculpture of antiquity had made its greatest successes. The image of man was considered an adequate representation of the deity. Otherwise in Christianity. It is true that we here have the greatest of all mysteries in this that God became flesh. But this revelation ends on the cross; the image of man is also the image of a servant and a sinner, which the Son of Man can only bear as opposed to (im *Widerspruch* mit) his divine essence. But this negative element the highest development of sculpture cannot reproduce. Only the "*crucifixus*" vividly presents this negative moment.

The representation then of the crucified Savior is the only form in which the sculptor's highest art can offer to the Christian cultus an object of real worth. In addition to this the Lord can be imaged only in his historical activity, for it is not the form and the appearance of the Savior which is, so to say, the fixed expression of the revelation of the divine, but the life and the works of Christ are such. But in his activity Christ can at most be represented only in relief. But in relief He then no longer appears as an independent object of veneration, for a relief is only an ornament which may call forth adoration but must not claim it. In this regard what has been said of the reliefs must be said of all the full figures which in the Gothic structures we find on the columns and portals and in the

woodwork on the altar chairs. But if even the image of the Lord as statue at an independent and prominent position causes us very properly to hesitate, then the statues of the apostles and saints should do this all the more, when they go beyond merely decorative purposes. It was a sign of the heathenism which, with the Renaissance, again found its way into the Middle Ages, that the Jesuitic Roman Catholics filled the churches that were being erected after the new style, with images of departed saints, which in turn became objects of actual adoration. The Evangelical Church in Copenhagen indeed boasts of having in her possession a number of the most wonderful statues made by the leading sculptor of this century, namely Thorwaldsen. But being objects of art of a most prominent kind there is danger that they convert the Church into a museum and attract the attention of the congregation to themselves as they stand in the "choir," and thus may be more injurious than useful; at any rate we do not believe that the Evangelical Churches should make the attempt to secure such objects for themselves. As we have before emphasized the proposition that the art of sculpture should occupy only a serving position to the Church, consistency demands that the sculptural art should be employed only for the purpose of decorating the place of worship but not to fill it with ambitious monuments, which suggest the thought that the building has been erected for the sake of the statues and not that the latter have been made for the former. The gentiles built temples for the statues of their gods, and the Roman Catholic Church, wherever she adopted gentile errors, has built chapels and churches for the pictures and the relics of the saints. The Evangelical Church can accept only such ornaments as are produced by an unselfish art for the purpose of

decorating in a symbolically significant manner the different parts of the house of God.

What has been said of sculpture is equally applicable to painting. This art too must not forget its position as a servant. And this it is all the less liable to forget there where it is used in glass and fresco painting only for the purposes of decoration than there where in actual picture painting on canvas or wood it becomes a comparatively independent art. Glass painting seems however to be relatively necessary in Gothic churches. The openings for light in a correctly built church of this kind would at the hours when the principal services are held, be apt to fill the Church with such an abundance of light that would easily interfere with the reverence and worship of the congregation. To prevent this it would indeed suffice simply to stain the glass or to bespeckle it in some way, after the manner of the window coverings used in former times. In this way that tinting of the light desired could be secured, which is so well adapted to produce in the mind that feeling of awe which the natural white light does not bring about. But it is no more than natural that just in the "choir," at that place to which the eyes of the congregation are directed, figures of significant importance should be seen, especially then when no altar picture covers the middle window. On the other hand an altar picture for many reasons could be dispensed with and a *crucifixus* be made to take its place when the windows too are decorated with symbolical figures. In this case then the middle "choir" window as also this altar picture should contain only illustrations of the life of Christ which directly or symbolically stand in close connection with the mystery of the Lord's Supper. In all cases the centre window could have as its leading ornamentation

only one scene out of the life of the Lord and all glass pictures must be restricted to biblical illustrations.

The Church of Christ is built upon the foundation of the apostles and the prophets, and in so far as the windows constitute a part of the sacred edifice the idea that, only prophets and apostles are the foundation of the church must find its expression. It must be pronounced a violation of churchly decorum when in the restoration of old churches prominent figures in the history of the church are put into the middle window of the "choir," as, for instance, this was done, even with the picture of Schleiermacher. The ideal world, into which the public services are to transfer us, excludes all the human actors in the history of the church with their more or less known failures and faults. The Roman Catholic church, with her false idealizing of her heroes, may consistently place images of saints and their legends in prominent positions. Evangelical truthfulness can make no concession to legends. Therefore according to our opinion, the reformers should be excluded, not only from the glass paintings in the "choir" but also from all other ornamentation that may find a place there. In its highest ideal feature public worship goes beyond the confessional limitation, at least, in so far as it does not in a positive way already in its whole manner emphasize the demarcation lines over against other churches. The Evangelical Christian in the public service desires to confess and worship with the whole Christian Church, even if the particular manner in which he prays and worships is modified by his confessional standpoint. The heroic personages in the history of the church may be presented in pictures or image before us, as witnesses directing us on the right way, but the goal for our eyes must be that ideal world which we find re-

vealed in the Scriptures. No matter how much scientific research may attempt to obliterate the characteristic difference between sacred and church history, for the congregations this difference is sharply marked, and only the images and scenes of the Bible are really deeply impressed on, and popular in the minds of the congregation. This popularity of the Biblical images can be permanently secured only when the congregation is allowed to retain the traditional conception concerning Biblical persons and events. Since full authentic accounts of these persons and events are wanting the traditional conception of them has for us in a certain sense the force of authentic representation. However we may in general think of idealism and naturalism in the domain of art, it cannot be a matter of doubt that naturalism in the shape in which it has of late been becoming prominent in Biblical history has no right whatever in the Christian Church. The idealism which is absolutely necessary here does not indeed demand a Nazarene overspirituality, but can very properly be joined with a certain naif realism. Of course the attempt made after the manner of the Middle Ages, to depict the Biblical world in the full colors of the present and of the artist's nationality, would presuppose a simplicity of mind on the part of the congregation which can no longer be found anywhere. The popularity which must be demanded forbids in regard to the representation of the spiritual ideas, the employment of the conceptions of the individual or artistic combinations. That the painting on glass even more than fresco painting or painting on canvass or boards precludes liberty of action and compels an approach to the Byzantine style or the so-called stylistic representation results from the use of mathematical forms, which the picture must employ.

Of course we must ask what opportunities then for pictorial representations are still left outside of the "choir." Pictures on the side windows can in most cases be regarded as unnecessary. Wherever the necessity of tinting the light does not appear undesirable, a simple speckling of the windows would suffice. Only the west window, in case the organ does not interfere between it and the congregation, may contain a picture illustrating the importance of music for the public worship. For fresco painting the Gothic structure offers but few opportunities. And yet fresco painting, on account of its powerful but simple strokes or lines, appears to be more popular and appropriate for church purposes than other kinds, and large images in the "choir" of a Romantic Church or on the arched ceiling of a gothic "choir" are regarded as suitable ornaments. Only the ceiling pictures of the Renaissance and Rococo churches of the Jesuits with their Christian olympus appear to be all the less suitable for a Christian Church, since not even with the necessary strain of the neck on the part of the congregation a clear idea can be gained of these pictures which are more suitable for the ceilings of princely palaces.

But also for canvas painting the Evangelical house of worship offers few opportunities except on the altar, unless we think of the front and side spaces, which may be used for such purposes. The fact that painting in modern times has produced such poor pictures of religious subjects may be owing to this that it finds so little demand and pay in the churches. However much one may be inclined to lament the decay of religious painting, and however thankful the church should be for a really noble picture conceived in a truly Christian spirit, yet with all that we must be satisfied if our churches are prevented from becoming museums of

art by containing pictures which do not supply a real demand but seek only an opportunity for exhibition.

Under the name of "paramentics" a new art has in our day found employment in church ornamentation, namely the art of needlework. The more this art from the outset occupies a serving position, all the less will it have any prospects to secure an independent sphere of activity and be able to secure for its ideas and thoughts any recognition of the right of equality with the demands of the Church. With all the less fear can we therefore bid it welcome, and can we rejoice when not only the vessels used in the culture are beautifully and suggestively ornamented by architect and sculptor in harmony with the character of the whole house of God, but when the garments that are used in the service of these vessels are made pleasant for the worshiper by suitable decoration, and when even from these comparatively subordinate pieces a profane lack of taste is kept away, which sometimes goes so far as to put upon the altar covering the name of the founder or lays down before the altar a carpet decorated with roses such as we would scarcely be willing to allow to lie before our beds.

If in this way the plastic arts labor together in the proper manner to make the place where the congregation assembles itself, a mute testimony of the heavenly things which have been revealed in Christ Jesus, and also of the eternal world, of which the public worship is to give us a foretaste, then too it will be made far easier for the congregation to elevate itself above the daily doings, and the joys and sorrows of this life. The eye is the organ through which the outer world can most powerfully effect the world within. Therefore it is important that to the eyes of the congregation, even if this is done only in picture and imita-

tion, the higher world should be presented. But the more spiritual organ for the understanding of the outer world is the ear. Therefore the hearing must accompany seeing, and the oratoric or speaking arts must follow the plastic.

*B. THE SPEAKING ARTS.**

If already in the sphere of the plastic arts, which were especially called forth and conditioned by the cultus of the Church, the development of such arts distinguished itself in many essential points from that of pre-Christian times, much more do we find this to be the case when we come to the sphere of the speaking arts. Christianity has proved itself no less potent and important to the deeper formation of the subjective life, than it has to the understanding of the historic. And this latter fact explains why Christianity has given to painting impulses much stronger than it has given and ever can give to sculpture, an art in which the ancient world obtained such mastery. But for this very reason, too, those arts which more than any other give expression to the inner life, namely music and lyric poetry, were brought to a proper recognition and to a high state of efficiency only by the entrance of Christianity into the world. It is true, that of music in general there was no lack in the religious exercises of the heathens; but what a horrid noise their music was! This noise, produced by the striking together of pieces of metal, when not made to open the ears of the god, was designed to stupify the otherwise clear consciousness of the worshipers, since—as it was thought—the divine can only communicate itself to the human when the latter is in an ecstatic condition. Even

*Tr. by C. H. L. S.

the noise of the corybants found a place in the religion of the ancients. But by the influence of Christianity the sounding brass ceased to be a tinkling cymbal. And now the bells of our churches send out their missionary call to the wide world around them with tones at once long and loud, solemn and sweet; and this they do not (as the paganising superstition of the middle ages interpreted it) to carry the petitions of the worshiping congregation heavenward, but to arouse the consciousness of the congregation to the importance of things eternal, and to invite the multitudes to the assembly of saints that they may there find entrance to another and better world. The bell is thus become the proper symbol of the missionary character of the Gospel which invites to the great supper all that are afar. The chime of the church bells produces a decidedly religious impression. But this is not the only metal that gives tongue to Christianity and can lend aid toward a life of godliness and of worship. The heart of the worshiper moved by the tones of the bell is especially moved when, on entering the house of God, the sound of the bell is relieved by the more expressive sounds of the organ.

The organ, next to the human voice the most musical of all instruments, finds its origin in the shepherd's flute or the bag-pipe. As the ancient (pagan) religions were unable to find a distinctive difference between religious service on the one hand and art on the other, no more had they at their command a musical instrument for specifically religious purposes. The flute or the guitar which was used to delight the drunken after their feasting, the same was used at their religious exercises. The organ of the Christian Church of the West is a musical instrument which, so to speak, cannot withdraw itself from the service of religion.

without contradicting the very purpose of its existence; it certainly cannot accompany the play or the dance or give expression to the base lusts of the flesh without disgrace to itself or without doing violence to its own nature. On the other hand, there is found no mechanism constructed of dead material which, like the organ, is able to give expression to such religious emotions as may rise in the human heart. Above all is the organ able with its mighty waves of sound to subdue the profane thoughts and feelings with which the worshipers may enter the house of God, and thus complete the work begun by the bell. Moreover, the rather vague mood produced by the latter is by the organ rendered more individualistic, thus producing a common religious sentiment and leading over into the subjective religious fellowship. Of course, of this last we can not properly speak until the congregation itself has become active in song, and has thereby passed out from the domain of its purely subjective but still rather vague state of mind. But then, this joint action (congregational singing) of a multitude not schooled or trained for it, how can it proceed without the direction and support of the organ which enfolds and harmonizes the voices of the many that engage in it?

The more perfectly the organ is made to answer the demands of the cultus, all the more questionable becomes the introduction into worship of other instruments. The trumpet, with the Old Testament tradition and its manifold symbolic use in the New Testament writing as well as in Christian art generally in its favor, has indeed a well-merited right here, such indeed as a purist cannot wholly deny; and this is especially the case on festival occasions, when together with the organ it has a right to accompany the singing; but the attempt to introduce other instruments

will hardly be successful. An orchestral accompaniment would hardly do on account of the necessary simplicity of congregational singing. And as to other instruments, they would have to enter more independently, be it to accompany the soloists or to produce purely instrumental effects. But in either case, artistic effects would become the object, and thus the idea of service would be done away with, which certainly cannot be permitted. There is really no place in the service where instrumental music could properly be introduced; and if such a place can be found for choir or solo singing, the accompaniment of the latter by instrumental music (other than the organ) would again give to it too much importance, and thus break in on the order and the real end of worship. It is indeed proper that *before* the congregation begins its worship, a certain state of feeling be aroused by the pure tones of the organ; but evangelical worship is not made up of a state of feeling thus produced, nor should it continue and move in it. Preludes, therefore, should not be overlong The pleasure afforded by religious music as also by an artistic construction of the order of worship has, in some of the larger churches, led to the custom of inserting into the course of the service short concerts. We cannot look upon movements of this kind with any degree of favor; among others for the reason that the artists employed quite often noisily leave the church when their tasks are performed in order to escape participation in the services that follow. It is perfectly right and but proper to appreciate all music that is intended to produce and express religious emotions; but just as soon as such music becomes its own object and is produced for its own sake, there is no room for it in the order of worship the church-edifice is not intended to be a concert-room or a music-hall.

By what we have said we do not wish to deny the propriety of singing by a choir trained to an extent to which, in the nature of things, a whole congregation cannot be trained. With what right and in what measure such choir-singing may find a place in worship, it is for liturgies to decide. An old custom assigned the time between the readings of the Epistle and of the Gospel to the choir when, for a short time the appointed singers were allowed to act with a certain degree of freedom or independency. Whether, even at this place, a solo could be appropriately introduced, is more than doubtful. The choir derives its right from the idea of representing either the congregation in heaven or that on earth, in so far as it places its ideal in opposition to its empiric condition. The soloist, on the contrary, in so far as he does not for the time being merely step out from the choir in order to direct and support it, is in constant danger of making *himself* prominent as a special artist.

From this it follows that, from a purely liturgic point of view, we hold the introduction into the cultus of even the better class of musical compositions, such as Bach's and others', to be impracticable. In the so-called services of song, held especially on festival occasions, the attempt might be made to find room also for the more extensive works of the musical art; but it is certain that those grand and overwhelming creations of this art, which the evangelical spirit has produced in the realm of music, can never be fitted into and be comprised by the frame of the order of worship; much less will we dare to make the attempt to treat them as parts of worship proper, and thus wipe out the distinction existing between worshiping God and the enjoyment of art. In the Romish Church this is another matter. Its worship is, in matter of fact, the offering of ~

sacrifices; a worship therefore which does not depend on an active participation of the congregation. The latter remains essentially passive; and the value of its participation resolves itself into this that it receives pious impressions and that it forms pious resolutions—in a word, that by its presence it signifies its spirit of acquiescence or obedience. Hence, among the Romish it is but natural that the musical portion entering their cultus may or may not pass the understanding of the worshipers, and that little or no attention be paid to the inner participation of the congregation. Here the music of the service serves its purpose if it but produces some vague religious feelings on the part of the worshiping people. Church music on this very account can here move with much more freedom, and is subject only to purely musical or artistic considerations. Since the mass in the part of it allotted to the priest naturally assumes the character of a spectacular play, it is not at all surprising that the musical part attending it quite often degenerates into the operatic, and this too without offence to any one. The evangelical principle, on the other hand, which lays all stress on the inner and active participation of the congregation in divine worship, must pay special regard to the musical capacity of that congregation in order to secure the ends set forth by its principle of worship.

The choral may be designated, without hesitancy, as an essential peculiarity of evangelical worship. It is true that the choral did not originate with the Reformation: it was known already to the church of the middle ages; but it is begotten not of the spirit of that church but of the Germanic spirit; this latter with its love of song rested not until it found entrance for its songs into the Church; and this entrance was granted to it by the earlier Church only

to a very limited extent. Even to this day the choral is not a constituent part of the Romish order of worship; and besides the Romish Church has added nothing whatever to its development. Nevertheless is it most true that the choral belongs to the most important forms of vocal music. Originating in the songs of the people it bears, also as regards its musical feature and of this we here speak exclusively, the impress of a popular, artless and profound emotion. The choral is the popular song ennobled. Without any loss as regards popularity and simplicity, it is satiated with the breath of the most ideal of religious sentiment; and of what artistic development it is capable, and that too without loss of its real character, is known to all who have ever heard and felt the chorals introduced into the Matthew Passion by Bach. The highest work of art is that which is as comprehensible to the common people as it is satisfactory to the master of art; hence we may say that many of our chorals bear the stamp of genuine works of art. And wherever the congregation actively incites as well as expresses her religious life by means of the chorals with which she is favored, there does she also constitute herself a true congregation and is she led to the most intimate communion of her members.

Howbeit, no songs without words; no singing without poetry. The Christian and the Evangelical worship particularly is a reasonable service of God. For this very reason such service dare not tarry in the mere emotional, but must combine with the emotion the thought and therefore also the word; and this combination of thoughts and words with the feelings and emotions of the heart is, or should be, poetry. Poetry, but not of every kind either. Epic and dramatic poetry, for example, cannot be admitted

to worship. True, inasmuch as Christianity is essentially history and this history is the source and support of all religious life and experience, it might be supposed that epic poetry, or history idealized, more than any other were entitled to a place as in Christianity so also in the Christian cultus. Nevertheless, the modern attempts at an epic treatment of the New Testament history—one or two works, perhaps excepted—are complete failures; and this not without good reasons. This is true of Klopstock's *Messiah* as well as of every other modern history of the Son of David. The fact is, that this history as we have it is already an ideal one; and every attempt to develop it or to supplement it produces but another proof that here we have to do with a history that was not and could not be invented by men; and then too the proof, that the human mind is wholly unable to combine in an expressive manner the full ideality with the full truth of this history. If anywhere, it is into the sermon that the reproduction of the biblical narration can introduce in somewhat the element of epic poetry. But even if man had received the gift to produce again in the form of poetry the holy history to his own satisfaction, such poetry could even then not be allowed a place in worship; for worship does not aim at a mere aesthetic or theoretic enjoyment of divine revelation, but at a most real communion with God and at an actual enjoyment of the things of God.

From the worship of the Eastern Church, which from the very beginning followed a strongly theoretic tendency and dedicated to the *άγια σοφία* its most glorious typical church-edifice, the worship of the Western Church distinguished itself in this that it assumed a more drastic character. The prevailing idea here is that the entire religious

process of reconciliation with God be lived through and experienced over again in worship. Hence the question suggests itself whether dramatic poetry is entitled to a place in the Church? In the old religions a close connection of the drama with worship was in vogue; then too do we find that as the Church of the middle ages introduced a sort of epic poetry into its legends of the saints, so the Mysteries of those ages, more or less religious in character, have actually given rise to the modern play of the theatre. However, the highest tragedy of the world's history, this tragedy the most real and historically true of all, will no more submit to a poetic reproduction than will the most pure and holy man of the world's history submit to an idealizing representation. And hence, the more the worship of God is forced into the forms of the drama, in the performance of which the congregation must of course co-operate, all the less can the drama be made to appear as an objective element of worship.

Lyric poetry, therefore, is alone entitled to a place in worship; and this by an undisputed right, especially when we consider the fact that the development of lyric poetry is most especially dependent on Christianity. To be sure, within the realm of this poetry it is again but the song in its most narrow sense that has a full right to a place in worship, to wit, the hymn. . . . The history of the hymnal is one with the history of its musical accompaniment, the choral. As is its melody so also is the text of our hymnals essentially Germanic as to its origin. Compared with the Latin hymns and sequences, in which the element of exalted grandeur finds especial expression, it will be noticed that in the Germanic hymns the more artless, popular and joyous element predominates; and it was by means of such

hymns that the Reformation sang itself, so to speak, into the hearts of the people. Luther himself already had cast into Germanic forms the Sequence and Hymnus of the Latins; and the German hymnology itself is divisible into several classes or styles, being characterized the one by its easy airy soar, the other by its profound earnestness expressed in mighty harmony, and a third by holy joyousness of the Christian life. But just because the mass of church hymns is so very great, a sound criticism becomes all the more imperative; and we must necessarily adopt certain principles to guide us in the selection of hymns for churchly use.

And here too we hold fast to the principle that the relation of art to the Church is that of a servant. We therefore first of all demand truth and simplicity as essential qualities of a good hymn.

As regards the import or substance of the hymn we must be guided by the truth of revelation, and not by any rule of aesthetics or by our own tastes and desires in this respect. The contents must have been derived from the Scriptures and be accompanied by the witness of religious experience. Matter which is unable to find a connecting link of some sort with the personal experience, not of any individual Christian but of Christians generally, and which besides can not trace its origin back to a biblical root, has no right to a place in the hymns of the Church. And this at the same time imperatively conditions a simplicity of form also. A superabundant pathos, for example, may be appropriate in a declamation, but never in a hymn. Then too there must be no seeking after grand and strange imagery or analogies; for it is just by this kind of excess

that the music of Klopstock for example has closed on itself the doors of the Church. The depth and the glory of the Christian revelation are rendered all the more conspicuous by the very simplicity of the forms in which they may be presented. To comport with its peculiar character and to answer its true purpose, the church-hymn should therefore largely move in the language of the Scriptures and from these borrow its illustrations. On these features will depend its popularity; and they will enable the congregation throughout to use it as the natural and easy expression of its own religious faith and consciousness. Howbeit, the hymn, to be such, must be poetry at the same time; and since it is intended to serve the propagation of dogmatical and ethical truth, the danger is that the poetic element is made to suffer too much at the expense of the didactic. It is very true that the fundamental truths of Christianity are in themselves poetic in their nature, inasmuch as they give expression to an ideal world and aspect of that world; but a purely didactic treatment or reconstruction of these truths actually excludes the poetry inherent in them. We have a few hymns of this sort which originated during the Reformation; being too doctrinal, they are poetically weak. But this is a small matter as compared to hymns of a later day: hymns that are nothing more than the dry effusions of moralizing reflection. Of true poetry there is in these products of rationalism not a trace, and their religious effects, in so far as they have any, is anything but beneficial. Happily, the Church of our own day has justly condemned these products of a faithless age; and the only question is whether, in the church as a whole, enough has been condemned.

But there are still other requirements to be exacted of

the hymns of the Church. Not every poem characteristic-ally Christian is for that reason already a hymn. A purely subjective religious experience or reflection of the individual Christian, no matter how ingenious its form and flow of thought may be, unfits a poem to be used as a church-hymn. Just as the popular lay, to be popular, must be born of the common life and feeling of the people, so must the hymn, to be a church-hymn, be born of the common faith and life of the church for which it is intended. The hymnology of the Church flourished in a time when the Christian faith was self-evidently the common faith of the Church; in a time when the individual did not feel himself constrained to give expression to his own conception of the truth and, in a polemical or apologetical way, to draw the dividing line between himself and others. Despite the gift of poetry which at present manifests itself among us in the domain of religious poetry, and not without success, it must be admitted that our own time is quite unproductive as regards church-hymns. It is a significant fact that the very spring-time of German literature has produced little or nothing in the line of hymns. The royal position to which poetry has been lifted by the masters of our literature, has unfitted this queen for service in the sanctuary. In addition to this it must be observed that just as in the domain of architecture the life of the worshiper manifests a predilection for the archaic distinguishing it from the profane, so also there is of the church-hymn required the sanctity of age (Edelrost) before it can find favor and be admitted into general use. A smooth logical and linguistic construction does not always further devotion or edification. Certain it is that in our day it will not do to offer for use in the church any new production except in connection with

some well-known melody properly belonging to another text. Then, as regards the production and introduction of new school melodies, it would seem that no one ventures even to think of such a thing any more; and yet, how very important to the hymnal text is the musical form! Our best hymns are found inseparably connected with their melodies; and to a hymn, in order to be artistically effective also, it is necessary that the melody used with it be well adapted to it at the same time.

Now if due regard were everywhere had to all these factors then no doubt would the compilation of hymns, as we have them at present in many hymn-books, be considerably reduced, and the repertory of hymns actually used would become much smaller than it now is. But, whatever compunctions of conscience the minister may have because, in his selection from the vast treasury of hymns at his disposal, he has too little regard for poetic merit and is too much bent on bringing home to his hearers such thoughts as fill his own mind—and how much worthless material may on this account be introduced into worship here and there—it remains true nevertheless that its hymnology constitutes a monumental glory of the evangelical Church, and that it is at the same time a mighty means unto true edification. Even the Reformed Church, constitutionally averse as it is to all art in worship and which for this reason excluded even the use of hymns, has with respect to the latter virtually abandoned its former position. It must be remarked however that at least the material imported to the continent from the churchly denominations of England and North America, sadly falls short of answering the conditions of a sound hymnology. The same is to some extent true of the efforts of German

pietism in this respect; in its one-sided practicalness it has substituted much bad verse for the good old hymn of the Church.

If, first of all, the singing serves a formative purpose as regards the congregation, and is in so far characteristically preparatory, yet has it a constituent place in the service proper. By means of singing hymns, the congregation prays, confesses, and reproduces the impression it has received from its actual communion with God. On account of this its importance, not too little space should be allotted to congregational singing in the course of the service. On the other hand there must not be a surfeit either, such as was largely the case in some churches of the past. It must be remembered that the choral, on account of the solemnity of its movement and the repetition of the same musical form, is very apt to drag and become wearisome, so that its best effects are lost; and besides, an opportunity is given to the congregation to take part in the service by singing in other sections of the order of worship, since the responsive service is not to be confined to the choir but is to be participated in by all. The artistic element which the Church possesses in this responsive service is of the greatest importance, and of great beauty. Take for example the prefaces and the doxologies. Conceding that these forms are integral parts of the service itself, it is all the more in place to enquire, if the order of their succession is to be arranged also on principles of art? In answer to this question we can only say that the worship as regards its substance is to be subject only to the Word of revelation and have respect only to the needs of the worshiping people. But the work of redemption, in which the depth of divine wisdom reveals itself, is, so to speak, the most wonderful piece of art that can be con-

ceived; and if the service is, upon the whole, to be an image of the redemption, it follows quite naturally that it will constitute itself artistically, and as a work of art present a pleasing harmony in all its combinations.

On the other hand, the disturbing element of sin must not be overlooked but it is the special business of the sermon to battle with it, and to expose it by removing from it every covering which the fastidious heart of man is so prone to draw over it. The sermon, therefore, less than anything else must not allow itself to be governed unconditionally by artistic and aesthetic considerations. Only on festival occasions, when the sermon is to show forth the general connection of the divine conception of salvation and of its execution, is the preacher to bear in mind that the worship of God here on earth is to give to the worshipers also a foretaste of the future glory. However, questions pertaining to the form and order of liturgical acts in particular and to the nature, purpose and arrangement of the sermon in general, would lead us beyond the limits of the task proposed in this article: our only purpose was to determine whether, and if, to what extent, such of the arts as exist independently of religion might find a place in the public worship of God. As an art in the narrow sense of the term we do not reckon oratory; and if worship is an art, it is such *sui generis*; and it always transcends the boundaries of art proper. We insist that the position of art is and must ever remain that of a servant wherever it is introduced into worship. And much as worship, by reason of the intimate connection existing between art and the religious life, may take into its service many of the arts, all the more must the distinction between these and religion be kept in view, especially there where their relationship is the most

intimate. This is necessary in order to guard against the notion that a person might possess himself of the salvation promised by Christianity as he does of the pleasure afforded by some work of art—to wit, by means of some phantastic and emotional process. The way to the peace of eternal glory, compared with which all earthly beauty is but a shadowy image, is by the very unaesthetic process of repentance and by that struggle with one's own heart which is not governed by any law or laws of beauty.

SOME QUALITIES OF EFFECTIVE PREACHING.

From Blakie's "The Work of the Ministry."

A third quality of effective preaching is

ADAPTATION

to the capacity and circumstances of the hearers. Of all public speakers, the preacher has most need to cultivate this quality. An ordinary congregation presents more *variety of capacity* than almost any other audience. Persons may be found in it of almost all varieties of education, from the most crude Boeotian to the most cultivated sage. The child of eight will be found side by side with the grandfather of eighty, and the babe in Christ with the mother in Israel, who, taught for half a century by the Holy Ghost, has been gaining wonderful insight into the things of God. One hearer may be ignorant of the very elements of Bible history and theological knowledge; another may possess an acquaintance with both, wonderful for his years and opportunities. The ability to feed the sheep and the lambs to-

gether, to write like the apostle in the same letter to little children, and to young men, and to fathers in Christ, is a marvelous achievement of Christian tact and wisdom.

In general, we may say that the more biblical any discourse is, the more will it be found to suit the several varieties of capacity. Our Lord's discourses are full of instruction here. And many of them—His parables for example—have this remarkable feature, that while fitted to interest all classes, even the humblest, they are adapted at the same time to give exercise to minds of the highest calibre, suggesting views of truth which such minds may find it most useful to ponder. And generally, the Bible, from first to last, will be found to be quite a model of adaptation to all the diversities with which the Christian minister has to deal, both in its general adaptation to general capacity, and in the portions which are specially fitted for those above that level and for those below.

Let it be observed, however, that while a preacher must aim at hitting the existing capacity of his audience, he ought at the same time to try to *enlarge* it, to accustom them to the *higher levels* of truth and experience. Some ministers have been wonderfully successful in this way, not merely conferring benefits on individuals in their flocks, but educating the flock itself—expanding its intellectual and spiritual capacity, and enabling it to find enjoyment and profit in regions that could at one time have seemed dark as a mine or inaccessible as an Alpine peak. In such cases, the success has been largely due to the silent impression which an able and well-instructed, and at the same time modest, man produces, of the reality of these higher levels, and of the precious deposits which they afford, by creating a strong sympathy with himself. He lifts them

up, or excites in them the desire to rise, whereas an instructor who is himself content to dwell in the more common levels creates no conception of anything higher, and inspires no upward desire. It is between two extremes that the true preacher must steer; between preaching so high that the people cannot rise with him, and preaching so low that they have no wish to rise. The golden mean is to strike their average capacity, but carry them gradually up.

Fourth. In all effective preaching there is an

ARRESTING ELEMENT.

It must seize on actual thoughts and feelings in the breasts of hearers, and use them as auxiliaries for spiritual impression.

It is of great importance, in this point of view, to get a common starting point with one's hearers. This is often furnished by special occurrences—remarkable providences that every one is struck by, or by human feelings, common to most men, but that commonly lie, as it were, in deep rock-pools, seldom stirred by other hands. Very often the preacher will excite a wonderful interest by quietly using his own experience of sin and infirmity, hope and fear, joy and sorrow, effort and disappointment, as the basis of his instructions. Few that have done so have failed to meet with illustrations almost ludicrous of the remarkable degree to which their lessons have struck home. A hearer will sometimes ask a friend with the most ingenuous solicitude, "Who could have told the preacher all about me? I felt that he was describing me to the very life." Most likely the preacher did nothing but delineate some common human experience: e. g. the disgust one has in certain

moods of mind at some besetting sin ; the vivid conviction that one has at these times that one will never again fall into it ; the gradual disappearance of that conviction, and one's horror at discovering by-and-by that one has fallen into it as badly as ever.*

This mode of rousing feeling in the heart of a hearer has an effect on the mind corresponding to that of a touch on the body. Abstract discussion may leave a hearer utterly unmoved, as much as if he were asleep. But touch such a person, even though his face were turned in the opposite direction ; the effect is first a surprise, then a concentration of his attention upon you. So if you come into contact with a hearer's mind by rousing some living thought or feeling, the effect is first a surprise, and then a concentration of his attention. And for a time at least he is at your command, and will hear anything that you may say. The metaphorical meaning of the word "touch" illustrates our position. A touching appeal is an appeal that rouses a living feeling—a chord vibrating in your soul comes into contact with a corresponding chord in another's, and sets it vibrating too ; and when the power is wielded by a man of much emotional sensibility the effect is overwhelming.

But whether by a touch or otherwise, it is of the greatest consequence to a preacher to get his lessons associated with something that has life and motion in the heart of his hearers. A dry preacher is one that pays no regard to this law of interesting discourse, but is content to let the stream of his thoughts, if there be a stream, flow on, without an attempt to bring them into contact with any thought or feeling that is active in his hearers. A commonplace

* "A man," says Cecil, "who talks to himself will find out what suits the heart of man ; some things respond, they ring again. Nothing of this sort is lost upon mankind ; it is worth its weight in gold for the service of the minister. He must remark too what it is that puzzles and distracts the mind ; all that is to be avoided. It may wear the garb of deep research, great acumen, and extensive learning ; but it is nothing to the mass of mankind."

preacher, in like manner, is content to utter statements, not because they are fitted to lay hold of anything living, or give life to anything dead, but simply because they are the things that it is most proper to say on the subject. No amount of fluency can atone for this defect. A flow of words without one arresting thought can never stir heart and soul. On the other hand, there are low clap-trap arts which some preachers resort to for the purpose of creating a surprise. There are men who utter *outré* things from the pulpit, on a principle not much higher than that on which a clown in a pantomime throws his body into grotesque attitudes or wears a dress of motley. If educated men know so little of what is stirring in the minds and hearts of their fellows, and have so few resources for attaching the great lessons of Christianity to these, as to be obliged to resort to the *outré* and the sensational, it is surely an indication that they are unequal to their task.

A *fifth* quality of effective preaching arises from its making use of a

VARIETY OF FACULTY

in order to obtain access to the souls of the audience. It is not content to gain or to hold possession by a single avenue, such as the reasoning faculty; it aims to bring into play the whole round of faculties by which the mind can be approached or influenced. In other words, it seeks to make the mode of appeal as varied as it is in the Bible.

All of us have probably known instances of very admirable discourses failing to produce much impression, because from first to last they were addressed to the logical faculty, and when that faculty became tired, as it does very quickly in uneducated hearers, no other was called in to relieve it. Men who are trained to follow the movements of the logical faculty may indeed find much pleasure in discourses where it is used almost alone, but used to excellent purpose; few intellectual treats are greater than a piece of powerful reasoning, when, either by clear statements that

commend themselves to our intuitions, or by a more formal mode of reasoning, light is thrown on the obscure, and truths that lay in shadowy corners are brought out into the clear sunshine. But in preaching, even the most logical minds are intolerable if their logic is not steeped, so to speak, in emotion; great masters of the art, like Jonathan Edwards or Canon Liddon, would be utter failures if the fervor of a burning heart did not glow in their discourses. Cold logic, like that of Butler's "Analogy," is unsuitable for public preaching. In common minds, and indeed it may be said in all minds, the imagination is the indispensable handmaid to logic. It is easily excited, even in the uneducated; it works for a considerable time not only without fatigue, but with an intense sense of enjoyment. Appeals to the feelings are also very effective, when managed with skill and moderation; but it must be remembered that if the feelings do not at once respond to such appeals they are liable to become hardened, and if they do respond, being tender and excitable, they are easily overpowered. The same remark may be made of the conscience. Obviously, the part of a skilful preacher is to appeal in due proportion to all the faculties, as he finds them appealed to in the Word of God.

Take, for example, the Epistle to the Romans. For the logical faculty there is noble exercise there, especially in the earlier chapters; but that unrivalled epistle would have been a very different production had no other faculty been appealed to. How skillfully, all through, are the other faculties called into operation! What a striking summons, for example, is given to conscience in the beginning of the second chapter: "And thinkest thou this, O man, that judgest them that do such things, and doest the same, that thou shalt escape the righteous judgment of God?" Nothing, by the way, can be more effective than to wake up conscience by a sudden and unexpected appeal like this; as is done also in some of our Lord's parables, or in Nathan's parable of the ewe lamb. It is like the sudden uncovering of a masked battery in war. In another part of the epistle

we find the moral instincts or intuitions brought skillfully into play: "If our unrighteousness commend the righteousness of God, what shall we say? Is God unrighteous who taketh vengeance? (I speak as a man.) God forbid; for then how shall God judge the world?" A little farther on we are borne on the outspread wings of imagination to hear the creation groaning and travailing in pain, and waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of the body. And in other places our feelings are laid siege to and carried captive: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out!" It is this variety of appeal that makes the Bible such a lively book, and such a contrast to the productions of those who by addressing themselves forever to a single faculty wear out their hearers. The best preachers in this respect are doubtless those who with as little effort as is apparent in the case of our Lord, or in that of St. Paul, are able to appeal to the several faculties in due proportion, and to get the best work out of each! In no case, of course, must the reasoning faculty be denied its own place. It is less shy, and at the same time more honest, than the feelings, which, if pressed too hard, will hide themselves altogether, or give, at best, but a one-sided decision. Direct appeals to the feelings are effective in proportion as they are rare. It is better to aim at a habit of moving them by sympathy; if the heart of the preacher be moved intensely by what he utters, that will serve to move the feelings of his audience. Indeed, it is only when the feelings of an audience have been brought up to a certain pitch by this process that the direct appeal carries the day.

Sixth. From the preceding remarks it follows that in effective preaching copious

ILLUSTRATION

is indispensable. The capacity of the human mind to appreciate resemblances and contrasts is one of its invariable characteristics, and it may

readily be turned by the preacher to valuable account. It enables him to lay stepping-stones along paths when otherwise he could not hope to conduct the larger portion of his hearers. It lends bright hues to subjects which would otherwise be too sombre, and catches the attention that in cases innumerable would be sure to be lost. It is in this light that we speak of it now. When ordained to the charge of his first congregation, the late Dr. Guthrie determined that whatever he might fail in, he would compel his hearers to attend. Watching, in the course of his first efforts, to discover what part of the discourses seemed to be most attended to, he saw that it was the illustrations. He accordingly resolved to cultivate that department with peculiar care. Cultivate it he did, and to the greatest purpose, for a greater master of illustration has never appeared in the pulpit, nor one who by means of it could more closely rivet the attention of his audience. But the copious use of illustration has higher sanction. Our Lord's discourses abound in it. His parables are illustrations all through. The Sermon on the Mount has hardly started before we find the salt of the earth, the light of the world, the city set on a hill, the candle under a bushel, and the candle on the candlestick. In their most solemn and impressive periods, too, Christ's discourses are pointed with illustrations. The Sermon on the Mount fills us with an overwhelming sense of the retributions of the day of doom, by the illustration of the house on the rock and the house on the sand. The parable of the last judgment makes a similar impression by the shepherd dividing his sheep from the goats. Nothing could repress the outflow of illustration from the mind of Jesus. In the deepest agony of the garden His sufferings were spoken of as a cup. The farewell discourse begins with the house of many mansions, has for its central subject the vine and its branches, and near its end introduces the woman in travail having sorrow when her hour is come, but after the child is born forgetting her anguish for joy that a man is born into the world. Probably it is not less instructive in another connection,

that there are *no* figures, and hardly any illustrations, in the *intercessory prayer*. When the address was to God, they were not needed. But on the way to Calvary the ever busy faculty again asserts itself in the address to the daughters of Jerusalem: "If they do these things in the *green tree*, what shall be done in the *dry*?"

There is this further to be said in favor of illustration, that it is adapted to take hold of all classes and ages of hearers. An apt illustration is fitted to interest the most cultivated philosopher and the youngest child. Illustration, in fact, is one of the chief instruments for enabling a preacher to fuse his audience together, and treat it as a unity. Some parts of a discourse may be adapted to one class, and some to another; but the illustrations are for all. They are the pictures of spoken instruction. Pictorial illustrations of Scripture, provided they be true, even if slight and almost crude, are not beneath the notice nor the interest of the most intellectual reader. And it is one of the signs of the times that illustrated works are for the most popular. Illustrated sermons are popular, too. And when the illustrations are wanting, the sermon is like a tree in winter, or a skeleton, or the bare ribs of a ship on the stocks; skillfully constructed it may be, but incomplete, and very soon tiresome.

Illustrations, however, even when good, and in good taste, may be overdone. They may be so superabundant as to overlay instruction, and make the discourse illustration *et praeterea nihil*. Care must be taken that a body of solid instruction underlies the more illustrative part. How wonderfully this was verified in the discourse of our Lord, a single instance will suffice to show. In a sense, the parable of the sower was all illustration, but it was not illustration only. There lay underneath every one of its figures an amazing amount of solid truth—a nucleus, so to speak, capable of being expanded to an all but unlimited extent.

Our Lord's habit is equally adapted to correct the error of those who present it in a style of gorgeous and tawdry embellishment.

We have said that illustrations are especially useful for the young. Indeed, if one desires to train oneself to the habitual use of suitable illustrations, one cannot do better than teach a class of children. In breaking down scriptural truth to them and getting them to understand it, one will constantly find the benefit of illustration. Men are but children of a larger growth, and the habit which one learns in dealing with the young will be of eminent service with the old. In dealing with children you are not apt to introduce illustrations merely for their own sake. You are not likely to get them up elaborately, as if your object were to show how beautiful a picture you can draw. Mr. Ruskin maintains, elaborately and truly, that whenever Art sets up on its own account, when it becomes the end of its own existence, instead of the hand-maid of truth and the spur to duty, it loses its legitimate function, it becomes a bastard. The same is true of the art of illustration. Illustration ought always to make what is on the other side *more clear*, never to obscure it. In the case of a Christian sermon it should make the Savior, His person and His work, more conspicuous and more commanding. Dr. Kidder gives this anecdote of a Spanish painter of the Lord's Supper: "It was his object to throw all the sublimity of his art into the figure and countenance of the Savior; but on the table in the foreground of the picture he painted some cups with such extraordinary beauty and skill that the attention of all who came to see the picture was at once attracted to the cups, and every one was loud in their praise. The painter observing this, saw that he had failed in his design of directing attention to the principal object in the picture, and exclaiming, 'I have made a mistake, for these cups direct the eyes of the spectator from the Master,' he immediately seized his brush and dashed them from the canvas."

So should we dash from our sermons everything that obscures truth rather than brightens it, and throws its shadow on Him whom every power should be employed to delineate "fairer than the children of men."

COLUMBUS
THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.

OCTOBER, 1887.

No. 5.

THAT THE MAN OF GOD MAY BE PERFECT.

2 TIM. 3, 17.

It is a well-known fact that the doctrine of Justification without the deeds of the Law and through faith alone, is by many regarded as a hindrance to personal sanctification and Christian activity. This objection to it is as old as is the doctrine itself; and it has been a source of contention and schism in the Church from the beginning. It is to this unhappy antagonism that St. Paul has reference when he says, "To Abraham and his seed was the promise given; but as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now." These words apply to the present also; for the feud between the work-righteous and the righteous by faith has up to this day abated in nothing. The importance of the conflict can not well be overestimated, since it is one of life and death to the soul; for "what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bond-woman and her son: for the son of the bond-woman shall not be heir with the son of the free-woman." Gal. 4, 21 sq. "Therefore by the deeds of the Law there shall no flesh be justified in His sight," Rom. 3, 20; "for by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." Eph. 2, 8.

VOL. VII.—17

That the doctrine of salvation by grace and through faith alone excludes entirely all notions of salvation by the love of man to God, and hence by any work of man, is evident; and it is expressly stated that it is "not of works, lest any man should boast." Eph. 2, 9. But then, on the other hand, that this love of God to man does logically oppose itself to man's love of God, and hence must practically lead the sinner thus saved to a state of carnal security and thence to sin, this no man of sane mind will venture to affirm. The reasoning that a person may add sin to sin because God in His mercy freely pardons the penitent, and that he may love God the less the more he is beloved of God, is so manifestly absurd that it is hard to understand how any one can be so blind as to be misled by it. It will readily be admitted by every one who is at all acquainted with the law of things spiritual, that the greater the love received the greater should be the love returned, and that the more free the love is that begets the more spontaneous will be the love that is begotten. Attention is called to this law of soul-life in our Lord's conversation with Simon the Pharisee, Luke 7; when, turning to the woman which was a sinner, He said to Simon, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little." Comp. v. 50.

Neither by sound logic nor by a right interpretation of Scripture are the opponents to the doctrine of Justification through faith alone, enabled to derive any foundation for their objections to it from the doctrine itself; for where this is properly understood it will be seen that it is in reality both a source and a safeguard of the true Christian life. By God's free justification of the sinner is the latter both taught and moved to love his God, and directed how to do so in a way acceptable.

Ishmael, however, must have something wherewith to justify, if he can, his persecution of Isaac; and so there must be a cause of some sort to account for his enmity. If not on the truth, it must be on some show of truth that the work-righteous base their unreasonable and godless attacks upon the faith-righteous; for they profess to be Christians, and they pretend to have the truth. Now the real ground of their enmity will be found to lie in themselves; but the occasion and the seeming excuse for it are, sad to say, but too often furnished them by many among those against whom they have arrayed themselves.

The Scripture doctrine of justification is a truth so simple but withal so thoroughly divine in conception, so wonderful in the fundamentals of its execution, so exceedingly gracious and rich in benefactions, and so decidedly spiritual in all its nature and throughout all its workings, that to understand it aright and to believe it truly, is for the natural man of all things the most difficult. In fact, of himself he cannot receive it at all; to do this, he must be led by the grace of God. But by that grace the heart of man, deceitful above all things and desperately wicked as it is, refuses to be led; and when it does submit, it is always only in part. This is especially the case when, as in the doctrine of free grace, the proud heart must humble itself and acknowledge that it is sinful unto death and culpable unto damnation, and that in this its miserable condition it is entirely helpless. Hence, whatever may be alleged as the reason for their enmity to the doctrine of justification by grace alone, the chief cause of their sin is beyond all doubt the pride and unbelief of their own hearts. They do not look at this blessed truth in the light of God's Word nor receive it in His power. And if ever the light of it is

brought to their understanding, it is by the conceit and sufficiency of self prevented from entering the heart. Such being the case, it is not surprising that they reason falsely concerning it and make war upon those who confess it. By the Scriptures, when these are fairly interpreted, the work-righteous are put wholly on the defensive in this controversy; all the more is it to be regretted that the most effective weapons of attack are placed into their hands by many among the advocates of the truth assailed. Wherever the doctrine of justification is rightly applied, it proves itself conducive to sanctification; but it is by some misapplied, and reproach is then brought upon it. Against this grievous offence St. Paul contends when, Rom. 6, he writes: "What shall we say then? shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid! how shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? . . . For sin shall not have dominion over you: for ye are not under the Law, but under grace. What then? shall we sin, because we are not under the Law, but under grace? God forbid?" On the same subject he writes to the Galatians, and in the same sense: "But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid! For if I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor." c. 2, 17-18. And St. Jude writes, v. 3-4: "Beloved, when I gave all diligence to write unto you of the common salvation, it was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints. For there are certain men crept in unawares, who were before of old ordained to this condemnation, ungodly men, turning the grace of our God into lasciviousness, and denying the only Lord God, and our Lord Jesus Christ."

From the ever blessed fact, that the grace of God is free and pardon is bestowed on the sinner without any price on his part, the carnal mind of man is prone to draw the dreadful conclusion that now we may continue in sin, or, that a few sins more or less is a matter of little moment. And from the frequent reference to it in the Scriptures, as well as from present observation, we see how very prevalent this deadly sin has been, and is, throughout the Church.

While this sin, so very hateful to God and hurtful to the soul, is by no means confined to them, yet must it be admitted that the Christians who profess the doctrine of justification through faith alone, are pre-eminently tempted by it. Alas, that so very many yield to this temptation, and that not a few are hardened by its deceitfulness! This fact once given them, to-wit, that the life does not adorn the doctrine professed, it becomes an easy matter for its enemies to ascribe to the doctrine itself all the sins of omission and commission which seem to be done in its name; and thus are the less discerning and unwary misled. The tree is known by its fruit, these are told; but that the plant of the vine is not the less noble because there are some that bear sour grapes, that is a truth withheld from them for some reason or other.

Which of the two, the righteous by faith or the righteous by works, abounds the more in the love and service of God, is, by the nature of things, no question at all; since every thing done by men from a notion of merit on their part and with a view to a reward from God as by right, is really no good work, neither is it accepted as such by the Lord. But the appearance of the greater fruitfulness in what seem to be good works is often on the side of the work-righteous. That this should be so, is unreasonable; and yet it is but

natural that such is the case; more particularly, it is just what might be expected, since human nature is moved by nothing so strongly as it is by considerations of profit and gain. But then again, eternal life is the gift of God, not a wages; and why, to thank his God for the gift received, a man should not be willing to do all he would do to acquire eternal life as a wages, if such it were, is strange indeed, and must so appear even to the unenlightened reason.

Of the ten lepers that were cleansed, but one returned to give glory to God; and he was a stranger to the house of Israel. The priest and the Levite, when they came to the man that had fallen among thieves who had stripped him of his raiment, wounded him and left him half dead by the way, went by on the other side; but another was a neighbor to him, and "he was a Samaritan." Now as at that time the children of the covenant were put to shame by such as were strangers to it, even so we find it now. How often do we, the members of the true visible Church, hear of works and gifts of love from without our own household, while from within our ears are made dull by the cries of the destitute and helpless, and the hands of the thousand that would labor are rendered feeble by the ten thousand that stand by idle, and not a few of them captious besides. Excuses here are plentiful, because cheap; and in most cases their worth comports with the price paid for them. Suppose it to be true, for example, that among others the means are more abundant and the motives less pure, is that a reason why we should be outdone by them in the Lord's work? Whatever be our condition as compared with that of others, it is not for the want of means but for the want of the good will to apply them, that the treasures the Lord has placed with us are always more than empty. Then, as to motives

here and motives there,—this is after all a matter in which we are not to judge any one except each one himself. But admitting that the judgment so often recurred to here is true, is it not then a reproach to the true faith that in the eyes of men it appears less active and liberal in the work of the Lord than does the false?

If now we dismiss all such comparisons, and examine our own selves in the face of God, we shall find that the graces of the Spirit are not as potent in our hearts as they should be; and hence the deplorable imperfections of our lives and labors. That God Himself, or His grace, or the means of its bestowal and operation might account for this condition of things, is a thought so irreverent that it can not be entertained for a moment. Nor can it be accounted for by any want of knowledge on our part, at least not generally, since as a church we are in possession of the divine truth in great measure and in exceptional purity: And yet is the cause of the evil, no less than the shame of it, to be sought for among ourselves. It lies somewhere within our own hearts and in their attitude towards the operations of the divine Spirit; there we must look for it and so look for it that we may be able to specify it and to single it out for thorough removal. *

The Lord our God, who has graciously begotten us for children to Himself, would employ us in the work of our own bringing up to manhood. Now in this work of edification, be it of ourselves or of others, we can be a help to God, or a hindrance. A help we are to Him when we allow His thoughts and ways with regard to it to become our own; and a hindrance, when this is not done. If we allow our own thoughts and ways to become effective along with those of God, the man produced by the joint labor is sure to be

one sick in body and crippled in limb. Applying these principles, in order to ascertain what may be the cause or the causes of any stagnation in our spiritual life, the double question arises: *In our individual ministrations to the soul, do we not stop short perhaps of God's own ideal of the man of God? and if not, do we always pursue the proper course to have that ideal realized?* The matter is certainly one of vital importance; and instead of deplored the fact that so many of our church-members are not what they should be and do not what is expected, we do well to inquire what is to be done to bring about a reformation. To stimulate reflection on this subject, and, if possible, to arrive at some result in regard to it, is the object of this article.

St. Paul in writing to Timothy, II. 3, 16-17, says: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, *that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works.*" Accordingly, and by the Holy Spirit's own testimony, the Scripture is given to the end that the man of God may be perfect; then, the Scripture is in itself so constituted that the end specified can be attained by it; and furthermore, that this end is not the child but the man of God, and that man made perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works. But now, the end for which the word has been bestowed and to reach which it is adapted, the same, and no other, must be the end also for our every use of the Word. The end of all our preaching and teaching and exemplifying it in our lives, whether in public or in private, is the man of God made perfect. "And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the

body of Christ: till we all come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." Eph. 4, 11-13.

Be it far from us to believe the lie of the Perfectionists, or to say one word in favor of their delusive opinions; for we know that the perfect man of God does not belong in this world of imperfection and sin, and that he is not attainable here. "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect: but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." Phil. 3, 12. Howbeit, the perfection of holiness not attainable here is promised us by the ever faithful God; it is set before us as that final condition of our being in which we shall be wholly conformed to the image of His Son. "Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when He shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is. And every man that hath this hope in Him purifieth himself, even as He is pure." 1 John 3, 2-3. Here again it is declared that the man of God in his entire perfection belongs to the kingdom of God lying in the future and which shall come to us with the last appearance of Christ; but just as plainly is it stated that this man's creation and his nurture unto perfection are to take place in the kingdom of the present. The man of God made perfect is thus set before us as the consummation of the Christian life; and though this cannot be fully achieved in time, yet in this present time is the life that is in us to strive for and to struggle on toward the goal set for it. Everything we do, should serve to advance us in that direction. "Brethren, I count not myself to have apprehended: but this one thing I do, forget-

ting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those things that are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.”¹⁷ Phil. 3, 13-14.

That, with reference simply to ourselves, nothing short of our own personal perfection is the divinely intended end of all our life and of this life’s activity, is a truth so clearly taught in the Word and so evident in itself that, to see and accept it at once, a Christian needs no more than have his attention called to it. In the image of God was he created; this image lost, God has in His providence spared man, and in His mercy redeemed him, to have this same image restored; and in order to it He would now sanctify him. As did the goodness and wisdom and power of God in man’s first creation, even so does the grace of God by Christ Jesus in man’s regeneration or second creation purpose to achieve a man holy in all his nature and perfect in his every thought and word and deed; and this, to the glory of his Maker. From childhood on we all have learned this blessed truth, and made profession of it. What in the Commandments we are required to be and to do, that, according to the Creed and the other chief articles of our Catechism, the triune God by all His doings for us and in us would enable us to be and to do; to-wit, “that we be holy and without blame before Him in love,” comp. Eph. 1, 3 et seq. Clearly and beautifully is this stated by Luther, especially in his explanation of the second article, when he says that Jesus Christ “has redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature, purchased and won me from all sins, from death and from the power of the devil that I may be His own, and live under Him in His kingdom, and serve Him in everlasting righteousness, innocence, and blessedness, even as He

has risen from the dead, lives and reigns to all eternity. This is most certainly true."

Yes, this is most certainly true; and clear and self-evident from a Christian point of view as this truth is, yet amid the things of this earth, its hurried activity, its temptations and the like, how easily does it escape the Christian's consciousness, and how very hard is it just for this truth of God to become, as it should be, the life-power of his heart and the rule of his life. All the more necessary does it become on this account that frequent and urgent attention be called to it. Does the instruction given in our churches and schools do this in such measure and manner as the importance of the subject demands? Is the high ideal—the man of God made perfect—constantly kept in view and pressed with that determination which is necessary in order to its realization, or is it lost sight of and perhaps another and lower one put in its stead?

It may not be fair to bring the direct charge, and if it were brought it might be difficult to establish it; nevertheless, it is hard to get rid of the impression that the standard of Christianity held up among us here and there is too low. Both from what one hears and reads now and then the conclusion might readily be drawn that the final object of Christ's work and Gospel with reference to man is not his perfection and holiness, but the pardoning of his guilt so that he may escape hell and enter heaven. That this is the low and sordid opinion of those—and they are found in great number all the world over—who constantly say to themselves, "There's time enough," and so put off their repentance from day to day, there can be no doubt; and it is an error that destroys thousands on thousands of souls. But how is it to be accounted for, and whence the wide-

spread error akin to it, that to continue in sin is a matter of rather small moment? To say that these dreadful errors are positively taught among us, would be slanderously false; and hence, if any one were charged with teaching the doctrine that a man's justification is the last and highest aim set for the Gospel of Christ, he would no doubt protest with holy horror against every imputation of that sort. Besides, it may confidently be affirmed that there is not one among us in the ministry who really holds to such erroneous views, and who would intentionally say or do anything to make impressions of that kind on others. But what is not done positively may yet be done negatively, so that by thoughtlessness and neglect results are produced that are not at all intended. Hence the question remains whether, by what we say and do, the impressions deprecated above are made by us inadvertently; if not, then perhaps negligently by what we fail to say or do? Aware that so many people who esteem themselves Christians fall into the combated error, do we what we can to correct them? Thus, to give but one example in point: When we rejoice over a sinner who has repented in the eleventh hour, is our sorrow over a whole life wasted in the service of sin as deep as it should be; and if so, do we also fearlessly give expression to it?

But the main point of our consideration, and the one to be made just here, is this, that in relation to the subject before us the doctrine of justification is apt to be abused. True, than this doctrine there is none more precious to the troubled soul that sues to God for peace and favor; for justified of God, a man is restored to the relation of child, the troubled conscience receives a peace that passes all understanding, so that a joy unspeakable and full of glory enters the heart. The consequence of all this grace received is,

that new life-powers begin to quicken and move the soul unto godliness. The justifying love of God is in fact so exceedingly great, that no mind of man can wholly comprehend it; and no tongue of man shall ever be able to tell all its glorious fulness; so that, considered by itself, it cannot be prized too highly. And yet there is a way in which too much may be made of it. This is done when the doctrine of justification is urged to the exclusion and disparagement of other doctrines, notably that of sanctification. A certain fulness and sufficiency are sometimes ascribed to the divine act of justification which this does not possess, nor is intended to possess; and the result is that a place is assigned to the doctrine that does not belong to it.

To be declared holy, is one thing; to be holy, is another: and the latter, not the former, is the true normal condition of man as the workmanship of God, be it by his first or his second creation. The justified state is the starting point of the Christian life, the holy state made perfect is its goal and resting point; and between the two lies the life-long way of sanctification—a process rooting in the one and reaching forth for the other. To a man on the way from the condition of sin to the condition of holiness, his justification constitutes the entrance way; and however much it may be to him as such and besides, never is he to rest there as though that were the end of the way of life and of God's purposes with regard to him. The question: how will the God of justice deal with me? is a great question for the soul to ask—and happy the soul that accepts the answer of pardoning grace; but of equal greatness is this other question, and one more noble, to wit: what would the God of love have me to be? and thrice happy

the soul that in itself is made to glow with the glory of God. Alas, that of the thousands who have been led to the first question; so very few arrive at the second; or who, when brought to it, earnestly occupy themselves with the answer. We may be mistaken, and we hope that we are; but it does seem to us as though a very large per centage of the Christians of to-day have no higher concern about their souls' relation to God than this that His wrath may be averted and that hell may be passed by, no matter how near they walk to its border. If there is among them any growth in the grace and knowledge of Christ Jesus, it is too small to be perceptible, even when a score of years is taken as a standard; besides, the little they may do towards it, or in evidence that they have not entirely fallen from grace, even that seems to be done as by constraint. In view of this sad state of affairs, happy are we who are called to edify one another, if in our ministry to others we are found blameless—if in our own consciousness we have preserved uninterruptedly the fact that the ideal Christian is not the man justified but the man justified *and* sanctified; and then, if in no way we have failed to bring this same fact to the consciousness of those, whom we are called to minister to. Holding up before them, as best we can according to the grace given us, the full stature of Christian manhood as the one and only condition of being for which God has created and redeemed us, and to which He would now have us brought, we shall have a good conscience before our Master, be the fruits of our labors whatever they may.

The fact assumed, however, that in our ministrations to the soul we start out with, and intend to keep constantly in view, “the man of God made perfect” as the object to be attained, the question remains—and this is the second point

of our inquiry—: do we also pursue the proper course to accomplish the end aimed at? The soul's justification and sanctification, though different and distinguishable acts of God, are yet inseparably connected. This fact, to begin with, may lead to a mistake; for since they are inseparable, it might seem that if we but see to it that the one act take place the other will follow and take care of itself. Thus logic at least might lead us to conclude; but logic is not a safe guide in spiritual things, unless it be that men allow the Spirit to do the reasoning. Now it is true that with the remission of the guilt of sin an impulse to subdue the power of sin is given, and that with the imputation of Christ's righteousness the principle of personal righteousness is at the same time lodged in the heart of the sinner so justified. But these powers and principles of personal holiness received into the soul in connection with justification are hardly more than germinal; and however healthy and strong the seed may be, yet it is but a seed; and if this is to grow and ripen and bear fruit, it must have the rain and sunshine of continued grace, and this again not only of the particular grace that justifies but of the manifold grace of God. If therefore in our labors in behalf of the soul we confine ourselves to the doctrine of justification with the expectation that this done all is done, and the soul will prosper, we are sure to deceive ourselves. Were we to do so and continue in so doing, then would we be like the man who is ever busy sowing seed, and it may be good seed at that, but who does nothing to secure and promote its growth. Moreover, and in order to expose the vanity of the hopes connected with such folly, we would act no more wisely than the man who, upon laying the foundation to a house, leaves it in the conceit that the superstructure will erect

itself. No, in order to secure the spiritual building which as workman for God we are employed to erect, we must use all the material furnished us for that purpose, and use it as directed. There are foundations that never grow into buildings and which in the course of time crumble back into dust; and such beginnings of spiritual buildings there are, and many of them fall back into ruin forever. Can it be that we are laying foundations, and are not building thereon? If not, whence are the thousands of Christians who are neither alive nor dead, neither hot nor cold? Thousands of this class are absolved year after year and numbered with Christians, but fruits meet for repentance there are hardly any.

The birth of the man of God takes place in and with his justification; and thence his growth also must proceed. From the particular grace he there received, he derives the most essential part of his nourishment—his bread and milk, so to speak;—but by no means all “the necessaries and conveniences” of the new life. It is perfectly right and proper, yea, it is absolutely necessary, to urge as one reason why we should love and serve God, His redeeming and pardoning love to us; and it is a strong and powerful one; and such it would prove itself much more than it does if only it were always made use of as it should be. For all that there is in it—and O, the fulness thereof!—let the doctrine of justification be urged to bring comfort and peace to the troubled soul, and to the troubled soul only; but this done, let the same doctrine be urged, and again for all there is in it—and here too, how very full it is!—in order to fill the soul so quieted with a grateful and joyous love to her Redeemer. To do both these things, it is necessary that the sanctifying worth no less than the justifying worth of the doctrine con-

stitute an integral part of the discourse ; the former is not to follow the latter as a mere appendix consisting of a few remarks, as is so often the case. Carnal security and spiritual indifference are sins by far more prevalent than are those of doubt and despair with reference to the saving mercy of God.

In connection with this it is not to be overlooked however that, while the justifying grace is a powerful motive to spiritual growth, it is not the only one. Not to mention the fact that He who is Love deserves to be loved for the sake of His own self, the motive in question does not cover wholly even that of gratitude, since the salvation of man from the guilt and penalty of sin is but one among the many gifts and benefactions of divine goodness and mercy.

When now we turn our attention to some of the several orders of thought that are employed to win men for personal holiness, it is, in view of the facts just pointed out, a strange thing that so many move within the syllogism of gratitude with the boon of justification in the premise, and that they rarely if ever get beyond this. To be sure, the grace of thankfulness is one of those virtues of which even the natural man has not become altogether insensible and which therefore commend themselves more readily to him than do many others; and this may, in part at least, account for the frequent appeals to it from the pulpit also.

“GOD IN HIS LOVE PARDONS ALL YOUR SINS, THEREFORE, IN GRATITUDE, YOU OUGHT TO LOVE HIM IN RETURN;”

that is, be holy and blameless before Him in love. In itself and as far as it goes, this proposition is a true one and unobjectionable ; and it may be made to do good service. It may

be made to do so, we say; for in the manner of its presentation it may also become both very faulty and weak. The latter will be the case when the impression is allowed to be made, first, that sanctification is a mere corollary to justification, that is, that it has no other ground and that it is something subordinate to the premise on which it is thus made to rest; then, secondly, that justification can be safe and sound even were sanctification not to ensue.—Besides, it is possible so to speak of our love to God as if it were to be given as an even-handed return or recompense for the favor received; but this is an error that has hardly found any room among us, and therefore may be passed by.

Whilst it cannot be denied that by the justifying grace in particular man's blessed indebtedness to love God is, if possible, multiplied a thousandfold, yet does an infinite debt of love to God exist aside from it, and the prime object of this grace is not to create and increase but to secure the payment of the debt already due. The love of God in Christ Jesus whereby He is moved not to regard our sins, is a love inconceivably great, and it draws us with great might to love Him again; but equally great at least, and not less potent as a motive to holiness, is that love in Christ which moves Him to bestow on us the graces of His Spirit in order that we may be renewed to His own likeness. So then to speak of justification as though it were the one and only reason why we ought now also to love God, is to say more than is strictly true, and detracts from the importance of personal sanctification.

More reprehensible than this error, because more pernicious, is that other one which joins too loosely the personal to the imputed righteousness. There is a false charity, coupled at times with a thoughtlessness bordering

on frivolity, that would make believe that a man can be a Christian and enter heaven anyway, even though he have not made the least advance toward holiness of heart and life. True, this last is not the ground of our acceptance before God; for that nothing avails save the perfect righteousness of Christ; but it is no less true that this righteousness can not be had except by true repentance and faith. Repentance, however, if at all sincere and true, includes the desire—weak though it may be—to be delivered also from the dominion of sin; and so faith, if genuine, does include the desire to live in communion with God, and to be and do something to His praise. But these very desires are an evidence of, and constitute in part, the holy life which by the operation of God's Spirit is made the soul's own. The justifying and sanctifying faith is one faith, and not two faiths; neither can the one act of this faith—its apprehension of Christ's righteousness—take place unless it be accompanied by the other—its reaching forth for the graces of the Spirit. Hence, if the process of sanctification has not set in and made the least advance in the soul, then is that soul not justified; it is still under wrath and excluded from the kingdom of God.

With greater fulness and much more forcibly is the relative importance of sanctification set forth in the statement that

GOD HAS RECONCILED US TO HIMSELF AND FORGIVES OUR SINS IN ORDER TO PRESENT US TO HIMSELF HOLY AND WITHOUT BLEMISH. Comp. Col. 1, 22; Eph. 5, 25-27; Titus 2, 14; Rom. C. 6. etc.

The proposition in this form has the advantage of laying special stress on personal holiness, inasmuch as this is put forward as the end of God's gracious dealings with us. Nor is

this saying any too much for it; "For God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness." 1 Thess. 4, 7. The fact that, as we are redeemed of God so we are by Him called also unto holiness of person and life, finds clear and strong expression when it is taught that from justification God will have us pass unto sanctification; yea, that in great part He forgives our sins to the end that we may sin no more, that is, that we become holy ourselves and in all manner of living.

Whilst thus, by designating it as an end, a certain prominence is here given to sanctification, yet is this form of teaching subject to some serious objections. Not necessarily but as a rule it is the case, that the means are of less value than is the end to be obtained by them; and hence the question, whether what we have gained for the doctrine of sanctification is not lost to that of justification, may well be asked. Again, the means may be had without the end, and without employing them to achieve the end; but what we desire to have expressed and, if possible, unmistakably expressed is, that the imputed and the personal righteousness are so bound together that the former can not be had without the latter. Moreover, and this is a third objection to the formula under consideration, the personal righteousness is to be declared not only as something very important and desirable to man but as something necessary, absolutely necessary to his salvation. The thesis we are in search of and which, if it can be found, should guide us in all our dealings with the souls of men for their salvation, is one that is adapted to do justice to both the cardinal doctrines of applied grace, and then on the one hand to cut off all misunderstandings and evasions of the deceitful heart; and, on the other, to lead this same heart to that state of immortal glory for which the Lord has redeemed it.

If we turn to the Scriptures in reference to this matter, we find that neither the one nor the other of the given forms of teaching is put to much use by them. In the first place, they teach us closely to distinguish between justification and sanctification as between two entirely different acts of God, telling us what are the nature and purpose of the one and what are those of the other; for themselves, however, they do not always *expressly* observe the distinction taught, since the words righteousness and holiness and their verbal relatives are sometimes used interchangeably by them to denote both these acts of God. E. g. John 17, 17; Acts 26, 18; Eph. 5, 26; Heb. 10, 10.—1 Tim. 6, 11; Tit. 3, 5; etc. In the second place, when both acts are spokon of and put into relation, they and the two results achieved by them respectively, are treated as coordinates. E. g. Acts 2, 38; 1 Cor. 6, 11; Tit. 2, 14; 3, 5; 1 John 1, 9; etc. In the third place, both are declared necessary to salvation, but necessary each in a way peculiar to itself. 2 Cor. 5, 21; Matt. 5, 20; Heb. 12, 14; Rom. 8, 9; etc. If now we ask, how is their necessity to salvation urged, we learn in answer: sometimes separately, but more frequently by far, conjointly; and this by the ever recurring form of the Gospel doctrine.

“BELIEVE ON THE LORD JESUS CHRIST AND THOU SHALT BE SAVED. (E. g. Acts 16, 31; John 3, 16; c. 6, 40 and 47; etc., etc.)

Believe, that is, by the operation of the Holy Ghost with thine heart receive and hold fast to Christ, and thou shalt be saved; be saved, that is, be delivered both from the guilt and penalty of sin and from its power, be renewed to the image of God, be satisfied with His blessedness and clad in His glory. This is the entire doctrine of applied

grace; and if so, this form of teaching, if any, is at the same time the one that must be adopted also to secure the object aimed at by the Gospel, to wit, "the man of God made perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works."

The doctrine of justification says: "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered;" (Rom. 4, 7); but the fuller doctrine of the Gospel says: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." To teach that the *righteousness* of Christ is necessary to salvation and is bestowed on every one that believes, is but a part of the Gospel doctrine: the whole counsel of God to our salvation is that *Christ* is necessary, and that He may be had through faith. Yes, Christ Himself and His saving fulness; for "as many as received Him, to them gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on His name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John 1, 12, 13. The full answer, therefore, to the soul's question: What must I do to be saved? when this is understood in the sense not in which it may be asked but in which it should be asked, is: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ."

But now, God's Christ is one and is indivisible; and in order to have and hold Him; we must accept the whole Christ. There is indeed an alternative here; it is this: either the whole of Christ, or nothing; and on the choice hang life and death eternal. Other alternative there is none. A part of Christ cannot be had except in imagination; and yet does the soul in her blindness and folly endeavor the impossible here: either it would accept the Savior and reject the Lord—as is the case among the faith-righteous,—or it would accept the Lord and reject the Savior—as do the work-righteous. To cut off, if possible, this soul-destroying

work of dismembering the person of Christ, and of disjointing His offices and work, and of so treating His gifts as if they were so many objects from which one might select or reject at will—we must insist on it that the whole Christ is necessary to salvation. True as it is that the righteousness of Christ imputed to faith is the only one in which we can stand before God, and on account of which alone we can receive any favor at the hand of God, yet is this blessed truth turned into a damning lie when it is so given or taken up by the mind, that the righteousness can be had without the Christ—or also, that the imputed righteousness can be accepted when the personal righteousness is rejected. And in view of the fact that so many people endeavor so to rest in their justification as though there were nothing more to reach out for, yes, that they even close their eyes to and set their hearts against this other—to wit, their own renewal—we have here a truth that cannot well be pressed on them too much. To be sure, to show to them the necessity of personal holiness will neither engender nor further this holiness in any positive way; but it will put out of the way hindrances which, if not removed, render sanctification impossible.

We have stated that the doctrine of sanctification as well as that of justification, is a doctrine of the Gospel; this may require an explanation, since to some it may seem that this is hardly true. To teach the necessity simply of holiness, is law; but so is it law to teach the necessity of righteousness. Now as it is Gospel to teach that God by Christ and for His sake will *bestow* righteousness on those who believe on Christ, so also is it Gospel to teach that God will for Christ's sake by His Spirit *work* righteousness in them that believe. Both are the acts of saving grace; and to win

the heart for its own sanctification, this must be presented to it as an act of God full of grace and blessedness.

Another question may here be asked, this namely, If the whole Christ is set forth as necessary to salvation, will not the discourse lack in analysis, definition and clearness, and hence lead to confusion of mind, and thus to errors more hurtful even than those to be avoided—say to the mixing up of Law and Gospel? To this we answer, that this danger is no more imminent here than it is elsewhere. But one example may serve to show this:

TO BE SAVED RECEIVE CHRIST,

Who of God is made unto you

- I. *Wisdom*;
- II. *Righteousness*;
- III. *Sanctification*; and

IV. *Redemption*. Thus the whole Christ is declared necessary to salvation; and if under each division it be made plain in what sense Christ is necessary to the sinner as Wisdom, as Righteousness, as Sanctification, and as Redemption—and in what sense He is not such and is not thus necessary—then shall we have all the qualities of clear and truthful presentation preserved.

The call to holiness, as it comes to us by Christ, is the call of grace by the Gospel's voice, and if in extending it we can get the hearer to listen to it as to glad tidings of great joy, then may we hope that he will desire to become a “man of God made perfect,” and his desire shall be satisfied from the fulness of God's saving grace.

C. H. L. S.

THE HISTORIC CHURCHES OF THE EAST.

In the East there are ecclesiastical as well as architectural ruins. *Ex oriente lux* was also true in the sense that in the East the new Christianity first gained a firm foothold. The first people among whom the Christian Church can be said to have received anything like a national acceptance was the Syrians. While we doubtless have complete historical records of the origin and early growth of the Western churches, the flourishing condition of many churches in the East at a comparatively early date is well attested. It was only when the inroads of Mohammedanism and of other anti-Christian forces made themselves felt that these once powerful churches began to disappear. The false prophet and his followers put the alternative before those whom they conquered of accepting either death or the new religion. It was chiefly this cause that brought about the destruction of the Persian, Armenian, Syrian and other churches of the Oriental Christendom as national and powerful organizations. Internally their decay had, to some extent at least, set in before this. The theological controversies of the early councils of the Church had not brought about peace among the discordant members, but each new issue seems to have been productive of one new sect which adopted the peculiar belief of this or that condemned teacher. The very *raison d'être* of their existence was thus the maintenance of some peculiar tenet, and when external foes came to internal dissensions, the house that was divided against itself soon fell to pieces. Those portions or parts which managed to survive such terrible fates, lived only as sectlets in a petrified formalism, living and

laboring for nothing else but the external preservation of the historic doctrines and liturgies of the Church. Only of late have some of these venerable church ruins of the East been discovered or more closely investigated, and have efforts been made to help them to new life and a revived faith. Not the least interesting in this regard are the Nestorians.

Nestorius, patriarch of Constantinople, taught that the two natures in Christ are not united, and that the divine did not partake of the sufferings of the Savior. This doctrine was condemned by the Council at Ephesus in 431. The adherents of Nestorian doctrine, however, have continued as a Church down to the present day. Their central seat is the most northwestern province of Persia called Azerbaijan, especially in the vicinity of lake Urumiyah, and the most northeastern province of Turkey in Asia, Kurdistan. To the same communion belong also the famous Thomas Christians of East India and Arabia, who are reported to number 70,000 souls. The Nestorians of Turkey and Persia number about 200,000, one-fourth of them in Persia. They repudiate Nestorius, although adhering to his tenets, and say that he never was their patriarch. They call themselves "Chaldee Christians," and speak a Syrian dialect not far removed from the language of the Peshitto, the famous Syrian translation of the Bible. American Christians should feel a special interest in the weal and woe of these peculiar people, as they were, so to say, rediscovered by American missionaries in the fourth and fifth decade of the present century. Rev. Mr. Stoddard, one of these gospel messengers, was the first to acquaint the learned world with their venerable language by publishing a grammar of that tongue in the fifth volume of the *Journal of the American Oriental*

Society. American missionaries also established a printing house in Urumiyah and issued translations of Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, Baxter's Saints' Rest and other works in the vernacular. Within the past few years an earnest effort has been made by men of the Nestorian Church itself to awaken it out of the lethargy of centuries, and introduce gospel vitality into the stiff formulas of traditional faith and worship. Through a various chain of vicissitudes a young Nestorian, Pera Johannes by name, found his way to Germany some years ago. He received a thorough theological training in the mission school at Hermannsburg and determined to go back to his people and preach to them the living gospel. Apparently he has been able better than were the foreign missionaries to awaken his countrymen to a consciousness of their actual condition and of the need of something better. He has recently returned to Europe and has brought with him a letter from the head of the native Church, addressed to "the beloved brethren of the Lutheran [i. e. Protestant] Church." The communication is deeply interesting and instructive, and being official in character contains important news as to the status of church affairs among the Nestorians. It is interesting enough in manner and matter to be reproduced entire. It reads:

"We would like to make you acquainted with the sad condition of our church. The sainted fathers of our church, wherever they established a Christian congregation, also founded at the side of it a cloister and a high school, and presented them with vineyards and farmlands, so that both cloister and school could be maintained. Besides this, every church had its own house of worship and its own school, both of which had their own property. In this way the Oriental Church under the leadership of the holy bishop of

Salik, spread over Arabia, Atoria (?), Armenia, Syria and other countries of Asia, down to the time of Mar [Lord] Jahvalahah, the patriarch of China, who dwelt in the city of Chan Balik, and lived in the time of Kaluka Chan, Emperor of China. After the death of this sainted patriarch, in the year 1304, the Muglers (Mongolians?) denied their Christian faith for carnal purposes and accepted the Mohammedan religion and joined in with the Arabs. Then they began to persecute the Christian Church in the East, and this persecution continued a long time, until all those cloisters mentioned before had lost their possessions. During these persecutions the Church suffered so much that it was almost destroyed, and only a small remnant remained in Azerbijan. These are we, who have amid these bloody persecutions indeed not entirely lost our Christian faith, but, yet this faith has suffered serious detriments. And now we do not know how and by what means we shall restore a living faith to our dead members; for we at present have neither the physical nor the spiritual powers to do so. We cannot plainly enough describe to you our oppressed condition. Think of the people of Israel in Egypt. At present both our clergy and our people are in deep spiritual darkness. It is true we still have the form of faith, but its kernel and the understanding of Scriptures and the education of the young we entirely lack and have lacked for a long time. Even our old books of doctrinal instructions have been lost. When we compare our former condition with that of the present time, we must lament with the prophet Jeremiah, Sam. 2, 11: 'Mine eyes do fail with tears, my bowels are troubled.'

Although our people are despised in your eyes on account of those who have come to you in order to beg for

their families, or have come to collect for schools and churches but turned out frauds, yet you must on that account not close your hearts to the appeal of our people, (1 John 3, 17. Gal. 6, 10), among whom are many thousands who know not what is right and what is left. Our church was the first which was active in the mission work. If you would now see her sad condition, your hearts would break, and you would say with Nehemiah, 13, 11: 'Why is the house of God forsaken?' You are doing nobly in seeing to it that the gospel is everywhere spread among the gentiles; but you must not forget the house of God that is through rottenness fallen to pieces. You have already sent us one missionary, Pastor Pera Johannes, who has received a theological education in Germany. He is filled with love and zeal to build up again the church of his fatherland now in ruins. During the winter we made the attempt of getting our priests to come together and to be instructed in theological knowledge, because they are very weak in this respect. But they were not even able to read and write their mother tongue correctly; all the less do they know the Bible. And if they themselves have nothing, how can they lead the flocks of the Christ? This little pastors' school is under the direction of Pera Johannes. Therefore we beg of you to have pity on us and to help us that this holy work may be continued. If we had means we would establish a higher institution, in which young men could receive a theological education. Not only will we not forget your kindness, but it will be remembered in heaven also. (Matt. 25, 40.) Our whole church will say: Lord remember all the love and kindness of our brethren.

Yours in the bonds of God's grace, and humbly awaiting your help,

JACOB MAR GABRIEL,
Bishop of the Syrian Church in Azerbijan.

This letter so thoroughly Oriental in its character, was addressed primarily to the German Lutherans in the Baltic province of Russia, principally because through political influence the Armenian, Syrian and other Christians in those districts have become acquainted with Protestants living within the Russian domains. Within the past few years a number of Nestorian and Armenian young men have been educated in the high and theological school at Raval, in the Baltic province, and some of them have returned to do missionary work among their countrymen from the standpoint of the Lutheran church. Pera Johannes seems to be successful to a measure in awakening the clergy and churches of his land to a new Christian life. He has established four schools, the teachers of which have been educated by himself. He daily holds two services and on Sunday four, all of them well attended. He still remains in connection with the Nestorian church, the aim being to reform the church from within by arousing and introducing those who are in official connection with it. Paulus Alamasha, a brother of Pera Johannes, was last year studying in Hermannsburg, and it was his intention, upon his return, to assist in the great work.

In the meanwhile missionary efforts from another direction are being made. The High Church party of the Church of England have recently, after much correspondence with the Patriarch Mar Shimoon, bishop of Kurdistan and after receiving and sending several delegations, established a mission among the Nestorians, for the present consisting of Rev. Canon MacLean and Rev. Mr. Brown. It seems that the hope for financial aid from the wealthy and powerful English Establishment has influenced the officials of the Nestorians to receive and even welcome these missiona-

ries. But the mission is high-church in the extreme, and the Nestorians fear that it is Roman Catholicism in disguise, a greater enemy than which they do not know of. A prominent Nestorian scholar recently wrote to a few countrymen in America in regard to this matter as follows:

"In regard to the Episcopalians, so far they do not seem to prosper greatly. Their doctrine of 'Mary the Mother of God' is perplexing their would-be followers. It has given rise to much discussion among them, and is not accepted. (However, in their class instruction Canon McClean cautiously teaches simply, 'Mary, Mother of the Word.') In short, our people are not pleased with their ritual or practice. It is only another form of Papacy, in name Episcopacy. You know that we Syrians (Nestorians) cannot be easily baptized into Papacy. Nor is it an easy matter for a Syrian heart to voluntarily acknowledge Mary as the Mother of God. For a thousand four hundred years we have borne without flinching the reproaches and flings of the learned and the ignorant among those who confess to the 'Motherhood of God.' Our exalted fathers contended against it, and would not accept the blind heresy. It cannot now be accepted. Although we are called Nestorians, and are counted heretics with Nestorius, for my part I regard no error so blind as this, that men should confess Jesus Christ the Savior, God complete, man complete, and then pass over the human nature, which took its form in the womb of the Virgin, and call her the 'Mother of God.' Then, whence was His humanity? How can the Almighty Creator (Col. 1, 16. 17) be the Son of a finite creature? I am not defending Nestorius. He was a Greek. We do not accept the name Nestorian. As Mar Abdishoo says, it is but a nickname. None of our fathers acknowledged it upon themselves."

Another church of the East, to whose character and history much interest attaches itself, is that of Ethiopia. In a number of particulars these people of Abyssinia, as the Ethiopia of former centuries is now called, are *sui generis*. They are the only people of the Lemetic family of nations that found its way to Africa. They belong to the same family to which the Hebrews belong, and their language is closely connected with the venerable ideom of the Old Testament. Indeed it is highly probable that at some early day they were in the closest connection with portions of the Hebrew people. In the western part of Abyssinia there still live a remarkable people called Falashas. They are the famous black Jews of Africa, or, as a recent traveller described them, coffee-colored. These Falashas still have the Old Testament in the Ethiopic dialect; they adhere to the Mosaic ritual, but, which is noteworthy, they know nothing of the Talmudic literature or of the Talmudic legislation. It would seem from this that they were at a very early date separated from the Jewish nation and found their way to the mountains and high table lands of Abyssinia, "the Switzerland of Africa," as this country is often called. Indeed their faith and worship would lead scholars to believe that their ancestors were not even acquainted with the state of Judaism and the phases of Jewish thought as these existed in the days of the New Testament. It is not therefore impossible that the Falashas may have found their way to Africa at even an earlier date than the Christian era and that we may have in them the descendants of some of the lost tribes. Missionary efforts among them have proved only partially successful. Some Gospel messengers sent out by the Basel Society have managed to organize two or three small congregations, but as a class the

Falashas are as strongly opposed to Christianity as were the contemporaries of the Savior.

The Abyssinians themselves show also in their religious observances some decided influences of Judaism. They practice circumcision, they observe a great number of fasts, have peculiar laws concerning pure and impure foods, and have similar practices that savor of Judaism. It is a question much discussed, whether they were converts to Judaism before they became Christians, and in this way retained some of their former beliefs, or whether they adopted these observances from their neighbors or took them from the Old Testament.

Abyssinia as a country was converted to Christianity in the fourth century. The nation's chronicles tell us that a Greek merchant was wrecked on the coast and that his two sons were saved. They were adopted by the king and in turn taught him and his household the Christian religion. This account agrees with the old Church historians in attributing the conversion of this country to the Greeks. It was under the influence of the Oriental Church that the Abyssinians were educated in the tenets of the new faith. The first bishop was ordained by Athanasius, the great defender of the doctrine of the Trinity. The connection with the Greek Church however ceased with the Monophysitic controversy. When the Synod of Chalcedon, in 451 A. D., condemned this heresy, the Church of Ethiopia together with that of Egypt, with which it has been and is yet organically connected, severed its connection with the General Church, and became, with some Syrian churches, the Monophysitic Church of the East. Two centuries later the Mohammedans took Egypt and separated geographically also what had before been spiritually separated. From that

time on the Ethiopic Church, which alone on the African continent was able to resist the power of the false religion, lived only to preserve its historic beliefs and worship. The conservative trait, which forms so decided a factor in the character of the Semitic mind, only became more powerful when danger from without threatened. Accordingly all conditions for preserving the outward form of the old religion were most favorable, and when, after centuries of separation from the civilization and religion of the West, Abyssinia was, so to say, rediscovered, its faith and worship was found to be a petrification of what these had been when it placed its errors against truth and on this account broke with the rest of Christianity. It requires but a little knowledge of the philosophy of history and of the character of these people to see why this should be thus. One advantage of this process of petrification has been that the Church of Ethiopia has preserved for us some excellent specimens of old Christian literature which had been lost to the rest of the Christian churches. At the head of these valuable documents stands a good translation of the Bible, made from the Septuagint, and which will be of the greatest importance in settling the oldest form of this Greek version. Then there are the Book of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the complete Pastor of Hermas, the Apostolic Constitutions, etc. This literature is especially rich in old liturgies, as the old Greek Church abounded in these, and many of them have been lost. A great deal of this literature has been published, but still more lies hidden in manuscript form in the libraries of London, Paris, Berlin, Frankfurt a. M. and Dresden, as also in the Vatican.

Missionaries have been sent to Abyssinia at various times during the past four hundred years. The Portuguese sent

the Jesuits to that country in the sixteenth century, and they managed to bring the king over to Roman Catholicism. The matter ended in a terrible persecution of the adherents of the old faith, who then arose in a mass and expelled the Jesuits. With this mission work almost rested until the beginning of the present century, and since then both Protestants and Catholics have put forth special efforts to bring a new spirit into the Christianity of venerable Abyssinia. The Basel and the London Societies have done the most in this regard, and down to 1850 much good was accomplished. Then the eccentric, but powerful king Theodorus, who wanted to use the missionaries for his political purposes, imprisoned them, and England sent an expedition under Lord Napier to release them. At the capture of Magdala, the capital of the country, the king committed suicide, but the missionaries were released. Since then they have almost been banished from the country. The present King John will not allow them to work there, and his war with the Italians, who are trying to secure a foothold on his coast, has not made the prospects of opening Abyssinia to Christian influence any brighter. Only Ras Alula, the powerful general in the southern province of Shoa, favors the entrance of missionaries, and this may help matters eventually.

G. H. S.

MARTHA AND MARY.

(From the German.)

Whilst we take up the narrative found St. Luke 10, 38-42 as the subject of our consideration, we would say by way of preface that, in the portion of the Lord's life here recorded, the particular item that shall engage us is the

historical sketch as such. We shall direct our attention (a) to the personality of Mary and of Martha in their attitudes respectively to the Lord; (b) to the peculiar testimony of the Lord with reference to the two sisters; and (c) to the profound truth resulting from this historic whole for our own benefit, and for that of the Church of all times.

That Martha and Mary, whom the Lord here visits, and the two sisters we read of in St. John c. 11 and 12, are the same, may exegetically be considered to be doubtlessly as true as for the right understanding of the passage before us it is important. The fact that St. Luke does not expressly mention Bethany as the dwelling place of the sisters, but merely remarks that "He entered into a certain village," is satisfactorily explained by the peculiar design of Luke's Gospel. Over against the many uncritical treatments of the Gospel history in his time, St. Luke, according to his own statement (1, 1-4), proposed to prepare an historico-critical work based on the evidence of eye-witnesses; and hence, wherever such written or oral evidence could not be had, he would make use of such expressions as might not exclude but rather include the more exact truth; even as he does here, when he says that "He went into a certain village."

Of the two sisters Martha is introduced to us with the words, "who received Him into *her* house;" and from this it would appear that she was the mistress of the house if not its owner, and that of the two she was the older sister. Now if this be so, and hence, if this fact may explain the particular *relation* which, according to our text, Martha and Mary assumed to *each other* in the presence of Christ—to wit, that of great hospitable activity on the part of Martha,

whilst that of Mary presents the picture of peaceful rest at the feet of the Lord, as though she herself was a guest of the house—then certainly must the explanation of the different and particular *relations* which these sisters assumed respectively *toward the Lord* be sought for beyond the domestic relations, and lie in something deeper than what is presented by these. The fact is that *in these two life-pictures of a Martha and a Mary we find given a clean and clear-cut expression of the difference between two distinct natural endowments*; in other words, *the sharp contrast of two Christian personalities*.

Mary, whose character is described by the words, “which also sat at Jesus’ feet, and heard His words,” is certainly of a melancholy temper; she has a profound, devout and thoughtful nature, and with her rich mind she has, like John, burried herself entirely in the divine human personality of Christ; and for this reason I would call her the St. John among Christian women. While she concentrates herself with all her powers upon the most immediate communion with Christ, she neither reflects nor calculates; but on this account does Mary lack neither in the inward (spiritual) *vitality* nor in the inward (spiritual) *clearness*. This is evident, not only from the passage under consideration and where, by following in simplicity the impulse only of her heart, she lays hold almost unconsciously of the “good part,” but especially from her last meeting with Christ prior to His passion, and when she anointed His feet. (John 12). To honor her Lord and to satisfy her love of Him, the most precious is not esteemed too precious by her. This same love by which she is willing to sacrifice all to Christ, opens up to her mind an (almost) immediate understanding of Christ’s holy being and work, so that she, more than all the other disciples, perceived—though it was with

quaking heart—the things that should come and that must come to pass; and it was from this living fulness of her bodeful heart that she was led to perform an act of such tender and withal such profound significance that on account of it her memory shall be held in honor in all the world and throughout all times.

In the holy *rest* in which Mary leans upon the *Lord* and, humbly sitting at His feet, her mind enters the depths of His Word—and then, in that immediate *contemplation* in which the truth unfolds itself, though often in the way of mere anticipation, yet fully and entirely—therein is Mary become the prototype of that Christian mysticism whose essence is holy rest in the personal communion with Christ, and whose cognitive method is the contemplative. By this, however, we do not mean to say that all mystics have souls like that of Mary; but this, that only those who have souls like that of Mary can be Christian mystics.

Martha is the exact counterpart of Mary. Whilst the latter moves above all within the domain of the most inward heart-life (*Gemuethsleben*) and concentrates this entirely upon one focus, the former, Martha, manifests herself as essentially the more objective and practically intelligent character—as a person whose mind is turned from the centre within to the world without, to the circumference of the Christian life, but which, constrained by the love of Christ, is bent upon drawing all life-relations into the service of Christ and sanctifying them by His Spirit. Hence the busy activity of Martha in “the service of the Lord;” and hence the unwearied employment of herself even in the kitchen and the cellar so that things, even the most small, may be made to do honor to the Lord and afford Him pleasure.

If this be true, then is it apparent, what grievous wrong

is done if, as is often the case, Martha is represented as the picture of a child of the world as it clings to the things of this earth, devotes itself to its vanities and cares, and is distracted by this world's unrest. But is this conception of Martha in harmony with that character which the Gospel history gives us of her in other places? Upon the death of her brother Lazarus she went forth to meet her friend and Savior; and though the latter had tarried by the way, she utters not a word of reproach; only the cry of grief: "Lord, if thou hadst been here, my brother had not died;" then immediately adds: "But I know that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God, God will give it thee;" and then confesses: "I believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world." Is such the language of a child of the world? And if, in the text before us, we find Martha busying herself with household affairs, what is it that constrains her so to be employed? Is it her fondness for house-keeping as such, or rather her love to the Lord? She is "troubled about many things," it is true; but only in order to serve the Lord; and is this reprehensible? That Martha, despite all her activity, has preserved a good conscience at least, appears from the fact that she can come to Jesus and say: "Lord, dost Thou not care that my sister has left me to serve alone? bid her therefore that she help me." This she can do because she is conscious of the fact that whatever she does, she does to honor her Lord and guest. And if in all this Martha had after all been a child of the world (and been prompted by its spirit), would the Lord have answered her as mildly as He did, saying: "Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and troubled about many things?" Is that the way in which Christ is wont to reprove the children of the world, especially where these

venture to judge the children of God? Is there not a certain acknowledgment of what Martha has done implied in Jesus' words, instead of these expressing an unqualified and unconditional reproof?

The habit which some preachers have of speaking in the same breath of Martha and of such people as follow the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life; or of such as "are indefatigably active in the affairs of the state or of the arts and sciences, but are so to serve not God but only themselves and the world"; or lastly of such as "eat their bread with sorrow and, without trust in God, are constantly troubled with the cares of this life" — such a treatment of the text is not only exegetically incorrect, but it is a homiletical wrong done to the *Christian* Martha who is thereby ignored, and to the congregation inasmuch as it is thus made difficult for the latter to distinguish between such cares as the Christian may have for the Lord's sake and the sorrows which harrass the heart of the wordling bent on living to the lusts of his flesh. To apply to people of such low description and to Martha without discrimination the Savior's words, "thou art careful, and troubled about many things," is to put Martha into the same category with them; and to do so, is, to say the least, a homiletical sin. Of such sins let us beware; for we shall find it no light matter to give account for them. Let us beware of the so-called association of ideas which endeavors to unite things heterogeneous, or rather mixes them up; let us beware of the science, falsely so-called, which pretends to preach anything and everything from one given text. The mastery in homiletics evinces itself there where one confines himself to that which the text *intends* to say, and only *can* say when taken in its connection with the Gospel history of which it is a

part. By following the analytical method one may be sure that he will be richly repaid in the matter of truth, life and color for what he may lose in the matter of scope by not following the synthetic mode of treatment.

Martha is no less than Mary, a child of God; and this practical truth we shall do well not to overlook. At the same time it is not to be denied that a profound contrast obtains between the thoughtful and reserved Mary on the one hand, and the eminently practical Martha on the other. The latter would seem to be just such a person as this life has need of; and she is the prototype of all those who are bent on bringing into subjection to the Lord all the spheres of this present life. Then, in this that Christ has room for a Martha no less than for a Mary, we have an evidence of the universality of Christianity: persons of every sort of endowment may embrace Christianity; and when they do so, they shall find each one a place exactly suited to his individuality, and that there is need of just such people as they may represent. Not only is the center of man's personal life to be filled with the spirit of Christ; but the universal character of the Christian religion demands that this latter cover all and that it extend itself to the very circumference of things, so that all things may be transfigured by the same Spirit. Besides, there is not only an immediate communion with God in Christ, such as is exercised in prayer and inward godliness as in the case of Mary; but there is also an immediate communion with God found in the manifold life-relations of this earth, of the earth that is God's and is destined to become His own more and more; and in order to realize which, such activity as Martha's is necessary.

But while we recognize the fact that such types as are represented by Martha and Mary are as such entitled to a

place in the kingdom of Christ, we must not forget that both are exposed each one to peculiar dangers. A Mary may be so completely wrapt up in herself as to become practically worthless to the world about her; nay, she may become a religious dreamer who lacks all energy to live and to labor for the Lord. A Martha, on the other hand, may so employ herself with externals, as to confound the form with the essence and the shadow with the living substance or spirit, and thus be deprived of the essential inner life of the Christian, and so lose Christ Himself and be led into the worst forms of religious fanaticism. On which side the dangers indicated are the more imminent, our text plainly shows; only Martha is addressed by the Lord, and though He does not rebuke her, yet is she warned.

Of Martha it is said in our text that she "was cumbered about much serving;" she was so taken up with serving that she was drawn away from the personal nearness of the Lord, and hence could not, as did Mary, sit at His feet and hear His Word. In this lies the doubtful and dangerous element of the attitude which Martha assumes toward the Lord. In the very act in which one desires to serve the Lord, be it with the purest zeal and the most upright love, one may be drawn away from the Lord and be deprived of the Word of His truth; and this all the more when one is "troubled about many things," when in one's holy zeal time is not taken to breathe, as it were, or to rest; in short, when one does not understand the evangelical art of properly redeeming the time. Yea, it is a most dangerous thing to the Christian life to be so bent on things external as to have no time left for collecting one's thoughts, and on account of the things done in the world *for* the Lord to forget, by way of the proper rest to gather strength *in* the Lord, in order to its

doing; and especially is this danger near when one overlooks the fact that all spiritual vitality must be derived from the Lord, and that such vitality can only be had when we humbly seat ourselves at His feet and hear His Word.

And hence the friendly warning voice of Christ: “*Martha, Martha, thou art careful, and troubled about many things. But one thing is needful!*”

What is this one thing needful? If it be answered,—not to mention here the really trivial explanations of some—as does *Rieger*: “The one thing needful is faith in Christ, and which faith is by His Word planted in the heart;” or, as does an English divine: “The one thing is Christ Himself, and by Him eternal life and salvation;” or, as does *De Wette*: “the proper or the right determination of life” (*die gute Lebenbestimmung*)—it must be remarked that all these explanations are but so many interpolations, that they are opposed to the context and based on the groundless and un-historic assumption that Martha was a child of the world, whom it was necessary to draw away from things earthly to things heavenly, from the world to Christ. Even *Meyer*, who understands *ενός* to mean also “the undivided surrender to Jesus’ Word of all interests,” can hardly be said to have elicited the *full* truth of the expression. It seems to us that the fact is generally overlooked that *ενός*, as its position indicates already, is put in direct and sharp antithesis to *περὶ πολλά*; and hence, that, *in and for itself*, it stands in no need of any farther definition.

To a Martha, who is troubled *περὶ πολλά*, the Lord says: *ενδεκτός δέ εστιν χρεία*. In opposition to mental dissipation and the improper diversion of one’s powers through cares about many things, the demand is made of directing and urging one’s life on toward *one end*. The one thing needful is, the

harmonious collection of all one's powers of body and soul toward, and the concentration of the entire man in body and soul upon one end. And this is a most general truth; it is a golden rule of life that applies to all the relations and circumstances of our being; but especially does it apply to Martha who, wrapped up in external officiousness as she was, was in danger of losing the true inner restfulness and sobriety of mind. But now, and more particularly, what may have been the one thing to which especially Martha was to direct her undivided attention? According to the narrative taken as a whole, it was certainly nothing other than "that good part" which Mary had already chosen and "which shall not be taken away from her." This however is not the general fellowship with Christ; for this Martha did not lack; what is meant is the direct personal communion with Christ by the Word, that is, the communion in which we, while sitting at His feet, hear the Lord and the Lord hears us. In other words: the one thing needful is above all things this, that we hold fellowship with Christ by means of a true study of the Scripture and of bold and cheerful prayer. Needful above all things is a holy rest in God: this especially is the fundamental condition of all true Christian life and activity. . . . *Mary, therefore, is to us the representative of the holy restfulness of our Christian life; Martha the representative of Christian labor.* The one should not be without the other. Whoever thinks that he can serve the Lord only by a sabbatical rest in Him, is as much mistaken as the one who thinks that He can serve His Lord only by laboring for Him—or the one who knows indeed the labor but not the rest of the Christian. The evangelical order in regard to these two sides of the Christian life is, that, while they should penetrate each other, the rest *in* the Lord is to precede the labor *for* the Lord.

Thus, in *Mary and Martha of Bethany* we find given two distinct Christian life-pictures; put side by side, or better yet, taken together, both are entitled to existence in the Church, and this all the more because the one supplements or completes the other. If this be correct, if *Mary and Martha* really represent two different sides of the one Christian life, then shall we be able to find their antitypes not only in the several individuals but also in the sum-total of individuals, that is, in the several Christian churches. Or are we mistaken when we say that the character of *Martha* belongs preeminently to the Romish Church—to that church which in her busy activity, in her restless formative impulses, in her love for externals, in her enforcing labors upon the masses, in her desire to render everything spiritual visible, in her zeal to make subservient to the Lord or rather to the church, and this as she conceives it, all relations of life, the arts and sciences, politics at home and politics international—but which Church, while so engaged, forgets humbly to sit at Jesus' feet in order to hear the words of His mouth? So again, are we mistaken if we ascribe the character of *Mary* to the Evangelical Church—to that church which humbly and unconditionally surrenders herself to the entire Lord and the power of His Word, and thus evinces the true spirituality and the strong and healthy desire ever to be found in living personal union with Christ? Nay even more than this: for may it not be said that this difference of character and of relation to the Lord has fixed itself dogmatically in the doctrines of justification and sanctification? The Romish church teaches that the way to the rest of the justified state is by way of the labor done in sanctification; the evangelical church teaches that (the joy and peace of the soul

justified through faith and that*) the restful life which the individual has in Christ leads to the Christian labor of sanctification.

But inasmuch as these antitypes are supplemental, and neither Mary can do without Martha nor Martha without Mary, it is to be observed that the Church as the one body of the Lord will only then stand forth in her integrity when within her the mind of Mary and the mind of Martha shall blend into one harmonious whole. And this shall be the case more and more if, on the one hand, the more feminine Marys shall assert themselves sufficiently in the proper time to step out into the world in order for it and in it to be something in the name of the Lord; and if, on the other hand, the more masculine Marthas shall remember that all sufficiency in spiritual things is of the Lord and that our labor can only be blessed of Him if we abide in personal fellowship with Him. And it may serve towards this consummation of the Church in perfection if among the churches the good in each be mutually recognized, and if the one learn of the other. . . . For the individual Christian, meanwhile, the rule obtains: see to it that in your own self the activity of Martha be joined to the mind of Mary, in order that thus the whole Church may, in the end, be glorified and be without speck or blemish; then shall the Lord, as once He loved to enter the house of the two sisters of Bethany, love to enter also our Bethany—the church militant and distressed as she now is—and so reveal Himself among us that all our warfare shall end in triumph and all our sorrow in joy.

C. H. L. S.

* Inserted by Tr.

A COMPLETE LIFE.

BY J. KER, IN "THE EXPOSITOR" OF LONDON.

"I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: Thy years are throughout all generations.—PSALM cii. 24.

This is a prayer which springs from the bosom of the Old Testament, and it bears the impress of its time. Life and immortality had not yet been brought to light; and long life in the land which the Lord their God had given them was a special promise made to these ancient saints. The prayer looks to that promise. The man asks that he may not be cut off prematurely from the work and enjoyment of life in this world. It is thus the request for a complete life. But he is a believing man who submits his wish to the will of God, and who is ready to accept life in the form in which God orders it. He feels that there can be no real life without God, but that with Him it is certain to have a perfect and happy issue. In such a prayer, then, a future and eternal life is implied. The desire for it is struggling in the man's soul, though the full vision of it has not yet opened before him. When the Gospel comes, and shows us eternal life in Jesus Christ, it merely unfolds into flower and fruit the germ which is already contained here. We shall avail ourselves of the light of the Gospel to explain what the meaning of this prayer is, and on what ground it is urged. Our subject briefly stated, then, is — A Complete Life, and the Plea for it.

1. When is it that a Life may be said to be Complete?

Here we may observe, that while length of life in this world is not the chief blessing of the New Testament, there is nothing wrong in desiring it, and that, when well used, it

may have on it special marks of God's wisdom and kindness. The love of life is natural, for God has given us a strong attachment to the world where our eyes have first opened on this beautiful earth and pleasant sunlight. He has surrounded us with families and friends, whose love makes existence sweet. There are duties to be performed in which we feel we are needed, and spiritual interests to be fixed and promoted before we enter with full acquiescence on the great and untried scenes that lie beyond. Length of days, like every other possession, like power, or wealth, or intellect, is a gift to be employed in God's service—the woof on which a good man may weave valuable material, and many rich and fair colors. And yet we must remember that long life has not always been granted to some of God's truest friends. Even in the Old Testament there is the lesson that a complete life does not need to be a prolonged one; the very first death recorded, that of Abel the righteous, was sudden and premature. Enoch lived but a short time on earth compared with his contemporaries, and Elijah was called away before his natural powers had failed. It is enough to recall Abijah the son of Jeroboam, and the good Josiah, and to mention, above all, that our Lord and Master, the central life of God's entire Word, was cut off long ere He had reached the mid-time of His days. It is necessary, then, in speaking of a complete life, to find those elements that will suit either him who has come to his grave in a full age, or the young who have been taken away in the beginning of their days. We thank God that in His Word we can find a goal where the old and the young may meet in a complete and perfect life.

The first thing needed to gain this is that a man should have lived long enough to secure God's favor. Until he has

found this he has not attained the end for which life has been given to an intelligent and responsible creature. Whatever else a man may possess in this world — its power, its fame, its riches, its learning — if he has not entered into the favor of God, if he is not living in his fellowship, he has not seen life. Its palace gate has not been opened to him, its light has not visited his eye, its pulse has not begun to beat in his heart. He is less the possessor of what he calls his own than Belshazzar was of his kingdom when his dethronement was being written on his palace wall; as little as a Pharach in his pyramid was lord of the treasures of Egypt. The favor of God alone can make anything on earth truly ours, and truly good; can give, to what is good, permanence, and render it a foretaste of things infinitely better. Whensoever a man dies without this, he is taken away in the midst of his days, hurried out of existence before he has secured its one grand prize. Death draws the curtain at midnight and breaks his dream: "Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be which thou hast provided?" But if God's favor has been gained, we can rejoice in the blessed equality of all who reach it. "The child dies an hundred years old;" the youth comes to his grave "in a full age, like a shock of corn cometh in, in his season." We lament early Christian deaths as untimely, but, in that favor of God which is life, every term attains maturity. Some find the gate of heaven by a short path, while others enter after long years of toil and travel. While some of us continue careful and cumbered about many things — an honorable work if we do not complain of it — there are those who go in and sit down at once at the feet of Christ, when they have found "the one thing needful, the good part which shall not

be taken away." Let me ask myself, Can I say that death shall find my life thus complete? There is but one way of assurance. It is through laying hold of that Savior of whom it is said, "Ye are complete in Him;" who offers Himself freely to our acceptance with the words, "He that findeth Me, findeth life, and shall obtain favor of the Lord."

A complete life has this in it still further, that it has done God and His world some service. We are not here merely to find God's favor, but to do God's work, to be followers of Christ who said, "I must work the works of Him who sent Me, while it is day." His was the one great perfect life, which never spared labor, never missed an opportunity, and looking back on which He could say calmly, "It is finished." How far we are from filling up that model! How ready, while the bridegroom tarries, to slumber and sleep, and awake with a start because we have let the supreme moment take us unawares! And, therefore, there are degrees of completeness even in Christian lives. They all reach the haven, but some of them with fuller sail and richer freight. The salvation in the great day will be to all God's people of free grace, and yet we must believe that its rest will be sweeter to the wearied laborer, and the enjoyment greater to him who brings home sheaves which are the fruit of tears and toil. "They joy before Him according to the joy of the harvest." But withal, and in view of those who have reaped long and largely, it is a comfort to think that no true Christian life is passed in vain. God will not terminate it till it can appear before Him in Christ's own spirit, "Behold, I and the children whom Thou hast given Me." Stephen's Christian life was short, and yet what ends it gained! The dying thief's was still shorter, but how many sermons his words have preached to dying

men! The child that Christ takes into His arms, through death, from its mother's bosom, can be made to draw the heart to the heavenly kingdom, and when we can do no work, but only lie passive in His keeping, we may be fulfilling purposes of far-reaching wisdom and mercy. It is a view of the coming judgment as wonderfully tender as sublime, that what Christians forget, Christ remembers, and reckons up, as done to Himself—the cup of cold water given in His name. It may stir us up, if we are indolent, to be active; it may persuade us, if we are weak and helpless, to lie resignedly still; it may encourage us to cast over our imperfect past His perfect righteousness, and to dedicate our feeble all to His service, when we have the assurance that whether the life be long or short, He will make it “neither barren nor unfruitful in the day of the Lord Jesus.”

The next thing we mention in a complete life is that it should close with submission to the call of God. Even a good man may not always be ready for this. Warm hearts and active natures are sometimes so interested in the friends and work around them, that it is hard to find an open place for parting. The speaker in this psalm felt it so, and Hezekiah likewise when he wept sore against the door of death. Yet God has His own way of making such as these resigned, and He doubtless does it in the secret of His presence, when we cannot hear their words of consent. But it is more pleasant to us when we hear from the lips, or see from the bearing, the act of self-surrender. Joseph reached it when he said so simply and quietly, “I die, and God will surely visit you;” and Moses, when leaving his great labor and wish unfinished, he looked up and touched completeness in that word, “Thou art a Rock, Thy work is perfect.” We have lived long enough when we can tranquilly give up

the problem we have been working at to God, that He may complete it—when we can rest assured that He will still be a God to us, and to our friends, though He makes death for awhile divide our paths; and that His way to the triumph of His cause can be over the graves of His servants, with a banner that never droops though the hands of all of us relax their hold. This submission may be gained through the long experience of the Christian life; it may be witnessed in the quiet peace with which the setting sun falls aslant on the softened look and silver hair, but it is granted often to those who close their eyes on a beautiful dawn, or bright noonday, as unrepiningly as if they had seen all God's goodness in the land of the living. There is a dew of youth that exhales in sunlight, as there is a dew of nightfall that waits for the morning. It comes, like God's dew, always from a clear sky, and tells of His completed work. The man is not torn from life but loosed. He signs his own name beneath God's discharge, and goes to other work which is ready for him. The great Roman general gathered his robes round him, under the strokes of his enemies, covered his face, and sank like a conqueror rather than a victim. But in that same Rome there was a nobler farewell to life when the Apostle said, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand;" and when he invited all to share in it "who love Christ's appearing." For still, when any one has learned at God's call to gather in human desires and hopes, and to put them in His hand, and has been seen, not with covered but open face, to meet the last enemy, his life is complete, for he is ready and willing to die.

The last thing we mention in a complete life is that it should look forward to a continual life with God. Without

this, all we have spoken of would be incomplete. What estimate can I set on God's favor if it lifts me up to the view of Divine loving-kindness, only to let me fall into nothingness? What deep interest can I be taking in the cause of truth and righteousness, if I have no care about seeing its progress and triumph? And how can I be ready to give up my earthly life at God's call, if I am bidding an eternal farewell to God Himself? Would it not be of all things the most imperfect and unnatural that a man should be a friend of God, and take delight in approaching to Him, and conversing with His thoughts as they speak to us in His Word and in His works, and that the man should feel, at every moment, that all this can be broken off for ever? that he should have a view of a universe of truth and beauty and goodness, opening up through parting clouds—of a divine purpose working to a far-off end which he knows and feels must come, and that he should lay down his head in the dust of utter forgetfulness, and be willing to have it so? Then, the higher the form of life the more miserable its issue. There are many bitter farewells in our world, but we can bear them all if we do not need to bid farewell to God; for to live with Him is to preserve the hope which shall restore all we meanwhile lose. But the thought of such a farewell has in it the proof that its reality is impossible. Where God shows His face, opens His heart, to a man, it is the seal of eternal life. This gift and calling of God is without repentance. And herein we have the assurance of the final completeness of a life. There is room here for rectifying all that is wrong, for supplying all that is wanting, for doing to us above all that we ask or think. It meets the longest life and the shortest with the same promise of perfection. Our night taper lasts long enough if it lets

in the eternal day. "He asked life of Thee, and Thou gavest it him, even length of days for ever and ever."

II. We come now to consider the Plea for a Complete Life which this prayer contains.

The Psalmist contrasts his days with God's years, his being cut off in the midst of his days with those years that are throughout all generations. There is deep pathos in it, a sense of his own utter frailty and evanescence. And yet in the heart of it there is faith and hope. It is an appeal to God as the possessor of a complete life in the most absolute sense, the inhabitant and owner of eternity. "Thou hast Thine own perfect and everlasting existence; give to Thy creature a share in it, according to his nature. He thirsts for life and comes to the fountain of it. Here in Thy world, or elsewhere, if it may be, let him live in Thy universe and look up to Thyself." In putting this plea beside the prayer, we do not in any way strain the meaning of the passage. Let any one read this psalm attentively, and he will feel that this is its entire bearing. We have a man to whom life, as he sees it, behind and around him, is broken and disappointing. His body, his spirit, his earthly relationships, the cause of God so dear to his heart, are falling to decay. What can he do but turn to God himself? What but hold fast by His eternity and unchanging purpose? In the mind of an ancient believer the prayer had reference, first and most clearly, to this present world; in our view it has widened to the full expectation of a world to come. But, by whomsoever presented, it expresses the instinctive aversion of man to give up a conscious and personal existence. It is a cry from the profoundest depths of the soul to be preserved from extinction, and it is a cry to its Maker founded on His nature

as the living, everlasting God. Let us look at some thoughts implied in this plea.

1. The eternal life of God suggests the thought of His power to grant this request. He is the possessor of independent and everlasting existence, and can share it with His creatures as seems good to Him. "He only hath immortality," that is, He only, as no one else. It belongs to Him, undervived, unconditioned, held by no will, ruled by no law out of Himself. But, as we see, He is a generous giver; it is His nature to be not only living, but life-giving. In His hand is the breath of all that lives, and the soul of all mankind. And they take from Him not so much as the showers of the earth do from the waters of the ocean, or the rays of the sun from the brightness of His orb; for these draw from the substance of their source, but the creatures of God derive being from His will, and leave Him unchanged and unchangeable. No one can rise to this view of God, without feeling that it is in His power to bestow life in higher and more enduring forms than any that are seen around us. Would it not be a most unnatural and irrational limitation of the Eternal Source of being to affirm that He can give origin only to kinds and measures of life such as appear in this world, that He can be the parent merely of creatures that die? If this world shows us the extent of His ability to be the Giver of life, it may be said that death more than life is the sign of His workmanship. The graves have long since far outnumbered the living inhabitants; and existence in the highest modes in which we are acquainted with it, is so brief, so troubled, so occupied with thoughts of its own preservation and fears of its extinction, that life can scarcely be enjoyed in the anticipation of the loss of it. An eternal and conscious Author of the world must surely have ability

to pass beyond the limits of our narrow experience, and must have some means of answering the cry of His intelligent creatures that "they may have life, and that they may have it more abundantly." This cry, so deep, so constant, whence does it come if it is not of His own prompting, and shall not the everlasting God be able to satisfy the desires He suggests? When we think of it thus, the tokens of His quickening and preserving power in nature come to sustain us. We can look not at the side of death but of life in them, at sunrises and springs and perpetual renewals, and we can reason that He who gives life in such wonderful profusion, can bestow it in still more glorious and permanent forms. "O Lord, Thou preservest man and beast. Therefore the children of men put their trust under the shadow of Thy wings. For with thee is the fountain of life; in Thy light shall we see light."

2. The eternal being of God suggests the thought of His immutability to secure the request. The unchangeableness of God in the midst of all the changes of our life is a deep source of comfort. Those ancient saints dwelt upon it more than we seem to do, and they were made very strong by it. It consoled them in the absence of the clear view of their own immortality; it was the soil in which the seed of it lay, and to which we should still seek to carry down the roots of our faith. Beneath this shifting face of things, where we look on endless change, there is a great Life that is not only the source but the sustenance of ours, a life that is not blind and purposeless, but conscious and wise. It is not merely a Life, but an ever-living One, and it is in His bosom that we are born and live and die. We have many deaths before we come to the last—some of them which seem sorcer than even the last can be—deaths of

desires, deaths of hopes, deaths of friends. And yet, if we have carried them to God, there has come, from these deaths, a life, some new and higher hope, some deeper and richer possession of the soul. Amid these changes we have felt that we were taking in something unchanging, felt, at least, that there was something unchanging which could be taken in. And this may give us the hope that the last change will have a like result, the last death a corresponding life to us. We may have the confidence of this if we realize the thought of an ever-living God, who not only gave being to our souls, but holds them in His hand, and puts into them desires after Himself. All the changes, whether of life or death, cannot affect our relation to Him, except in bringing us nearer. Without an eternal God, what refuge would there be for troubled souls? When the sea is tempest-tossed, we flee to land; when the land quakes, we look to heaven; when all things are dissolved, then to Him who says, "I am the Lord, I change not." We may lie quietly down in our little earthly homes when we have the overarching sky of God's hand above us, the shadow of the Almighty; and we may lie down hopefully in our graves, when we commit ourselves to an unchanging God. "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms."

3. Still further, the thought of God's eternal being suggests His Divine consistency as an encouragement to this request. He has done so much that we may infer He will, if we ask Him, do still more. Man's wish for immortality does not, as some say, spring from a mere animal craving, from the love of living on, but from his being made able to conceive of an endless existence. The lower creatures have no such desire, because they have no such con-

ception. But man can conceive of endless existence as in the possession of one great personal Being, and may plead for it on the ground that he has been made capable of looking forward to it. It could not be his Maker's design to tantalize him with a vision of what is for ever unattainable, to show him the glory of an endless life, and then to say to him, "This shall never be thine—no more of life for thee than this drop with which I now touch thy lips, and which awakens in thee the thirst to live on." What a universe would such a thought present to us! a God who drinks of the golden cup of immortality all alone, in full view of creatures whom He tempts with its sparkle, to whom He shakes some scattered drops from the brim, while they beg for more that they may not die, and beg in vain! For, let it be considered, that the life they ask, if it be a true request, is not a mere life of animal existence. There are ties formed here between soul and soul that cry out for an eternity to be renewed in, and better never to have known hearts so tender and true than to feel that we have bidden them an everlasting farewell. There are questions raised about the problems of being, the wisdom, the justice, the goodness of the arrangements of this universe, which our little life cannot answer, and which knock with an imperious demand at the eternal gate. Above all, there are the aspirations of the spirit after the infinite Friend and Father, for which we thank Him most, if He has stirred them within us, and which we know to be deep realities, longings that draw down Divine bequests, communings which find an answer from a Spirit higher than our own. Are these never to close upon their object, and become something more than glimpses and foretastes?

Let us think, then, with ourselves in this way: I feel

when I am in my best moments that these things are to be the perfection of my nature, if I ever reach it. But I cannot reach it without an immortality. Will not the Being who presents me with this aim, and has formed me capable of conceiving of an immortality, grant me the immortality without which the aim can never be reached? When I contemplate Him, I see that His eternity is the enclosing zone, the compact and mighty girdle of all His attributes, without which they would be scattered, conflicting forces, aimless and chaotic and fruitless. And what eternity is to God, immortality is to man. It is the indispensable requisite to the unity and completeness of his being. If, then, God has made Himself my highest standard, His unalterable truth and righteousness and goodness the goal towards which I should press, may I not expect that the course will be opened which leads to the goal? Without this, His attributes would be, for His children, the perpetual object of their despairing gaze. We may plead surely that He who has given us such a Divine plan of life should in His consistency make the term of our life commensurate with it. "O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days: Thy years are throughout all generations."

Last of all, let us say that God's eternal being is a plea for this request, because it suggests His Divine compassion for us. Those men who think they exalt God by making Him indifferent to humanity are as far wrong in their philosophy as in their divinity. They speak of Him as so high above us in His infinite nature that He regards us no more than we do the short-lived insects of a summer evening, or the drifting leaves on the autumn winds. But the greatest natures are the most sensitively tender, and a true man has a feeling akin to sympathy for the insect of a day, a touch

of pity when he sees the yellow leaf; if not for itself, yet for what it signifies. Great natures are made not more limited by their greatness, but more comprehensive; and the eternity of God does not shut out the thoughts and trials of human lives, but brings them more within His merciful regard. It is thus the Bible puts it, and it finds an echo in our hearts. "He knoweth our frame; He remembereth that we are dust." Frail man! "He remembered that they were but flesh, a wind that passeth away, and cometh not again." When we feel a touch of tenderness to the feeble creatures around us, to the bird or butterfly that sings its song, and flutters its hour, and dies, let us not imagine we are more compassionate than God. Every spark of mercy is from His hearth. And when He has put into our souls a sense of a higher life, and a cry for its fulness in Himself, let us not believe He will treat us worse than the beasts that perish, that He will meet their wants in His great liberality and leave ours in endless disappointment.

When we converse with such thoughts as these, when we feel that, short-lived and imperfect as we are, we can conceive of God's eternity, comprehend something of His consistency and compassion, our future life becomes not so much a thing of doubt. It is when we dwell only in dust that dust seems all. And we let the spirit waken and rise to God, it feels its kinship with His eternal nature, till we can say with the prophet, "Art not thou from everlasting, O Lord my God, my Holy One? we shall not die." It is not always that we can realize these truths, but, in the proportion in which we do, we feel them to be the power and blessedness of life. If we have not learned them at all, the shadow of the solemn words of Scripture falls from this

world upon eternity, "Without God, without hope." "He is light, and in Him is no darkness at all;" but without Him, the future is "a land of darkness, as darkness itself." The only way to have the hope of a blessed immortality is to have something in our souls which we can reasonably wish to be made immortal, something that is worthy to survive death and earth and time; that is, something of God within us now. As we live with him here, we have the assurance of living with him forever. Where He gives Himself, He gives a share in that eternity which is His home.

We should not leave the subject without saying a word about the full answer to this request. We have been dealing with a question which to some extent involves the answer; and it is well that it should be put in every point of view, in order that, when the answer is finally given, it may be felt to be sufficient. This, indeed, may be one reason why God left the wise men of the old heathen world to deal with this problem on a mere human basis, and why He put it in such different ways into the hearts of His ancient saints by His Holy Spirit—"If a man die, shall he live again?"

It was, no doubt, to fix attention on the great answer, and on Him who has given it. It will require time for this answer to work its way into the world's heart, as it required time to mature the question. But we who profess to be Christians should feel already how it meets the case. Our Savior Jesus Christ has appeared "to abolish death, and bring life and immortality to light through His Gospel." His earthly history shows us what a complete life is, a life led in no imaginary sphere, but amid the duties and temptations, the pains and sorrows, which daily press upon us. And it was followed by a death which puts us in a position

to aim at His life. When we receive it in its Divine meaning, "The Lord our Righteousness," it covers all the sinful past which paralyzes our endeavor, offers us a free pardon that we may serve God as His reconciled children, and secures that Holy Spirit who is the Giver of life, and who works all our works in us. And, what is most wonderful, while He was accomplishing all this, it was in a way that never removes Him out of the reach of our experience and sympathy. He was performing a work beyond our power, and yet walking the path we have to tread. The cry of frail dying man in these psalms passed through His heart and lips. He met death in the midst of His days, felt, as truly as we feel, its forebodings and bitterness, "offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto Him that was able to save Him from death, and was heard in that He feared." We may say that the struggles of His people in past ages crying for eternal life were breathed into them by Christ's own Spirit, and that then He entered man's world to gather these prayers into His own heart, and secure their answer. The Old Testament is man feeling after God, the New is God finding man, and He who is the Leader in both, who breathes the question into man's heart, and then answers it, is that Eternal Son "whose goings forth have been of old, from everlasting." And, now, the sharer of our dying nature, the sympathizer with its cries, the bearer of its sins, has become the Lord of eternal life. "Lord, to whom shall we go?" Let a man, let any man, come in humble faith and cast on Him the burden of guilt, and he will receive a Divine power from Christ Himself that will make his present life the beginning and the pledge of an everlasting one. Though the beginning be small, the latter end shall greatly increase; and when death

comes, the prayer, "O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days," will be changed into, "Lord, now lettest Thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation." "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit."

HOMILETICAL.

THANKSGIVING DAY.

TEXT: Ps. 66, 8-9 and 1 Thess. 5, 18.

Introduction. This day is set apart for national thanksgiving.—But it is to be feared that in the hearts and lives of many, of very many, it is a day of feasting and vain pleasure seeking, of rioting and drunkenness, of chambering and wantonness, of strife and envying. Though all have something to be thankful for, many of our people walk as without God in this present world, and have no one to whom they might say thanks even were their hearts stirred within them by joy of the bounties received.

It is not so with us; and God be thanked for this. We know that the earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof; and all its fulness, inasmuch as it comes from Him, is goodness. Ps. 24, 1 and 33, 5. The day we celebrate to us has a meaning: to us it is what it is called, a day of thanksgiving. To observe it, as becomes the people of God, we have come into the courts of the Lord to do what is His pleasure. And we find it pleasant so to do. Praise is comely.

"O BLESS OUR GOD YE PEOPLE, AND MAKE THE VOICE OF HIS PRAISE TO BE HEARD."

I. "*In everything give thanks*

- 1) *for all things, at all times and in all conditions of life,*
 - a) even for such things as are accounted evils and are grievous to the flesh, if but they come from God. For
 - b) "we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose." Rom. 8, 28.

Hence, had it pleased God to send war, pestilence, famine, etc., even then — thanks!

But no, none but good things have been given us as a people during the past year.

2) *Our national blessings*

- a) material;
- b) civil;
- c) religious.

Oh bless our God ye people, for

II. *This is the will of God in Christ Jesus concerning you."*

- 1) *For the sake of Jesus we are blest.*
- 2) *Through Him must we give thanks to render them acceptable.*

(The love of God to us is by Christ, and by Christ must be our return love.)

Oh bless our God, ye people, and make the voice of His praise to be heard.

C. H. L. S.

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. VI.

	PAGE.
1. HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS, ETC., by Rev. B. F. Schillinger.....	385
2. LATEST EVENTS UPON THE JEWISH MISSIONARY WORK, ETC., Translated by Rev. L. H. Schuh.....	399
3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette ..	411
4. A MOVEMENT THAT NEEDS WATCHING, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette ..	447

Monies Received for Volume VII.

Rev. R. Skyberg \$2.00—42. Rev. P. Hein \$1.50—48. Rev. J. Pedersen \$7.00—42. Rev. J. P. Hentz \$2.00—42. Rev. L. F. Meyer \$1.50—42. James M. Leonard \$2.00—48. Rev. G. Rasmussen \$1.00—36. Rev. G. F. H. Meiser \$1.50—48. Rev. G. W. Lose \$2.00—48. Rev. J. M. Koeppelin \$1.50—42. Prof. A. W. Lindemann \$6.00—42. Rev. W. Steinmann \$1.50—48. Rev. L. F. Mittler \$1.50—42. Rev. C. E. Herbst \$1.50—42.



COLUMBUS IOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

**MONTHLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF
THE EV. LUTHERAN CHURCH.**

ED BY THE FACULTY OF CAPITAL UNIVERSITY.

VOL. VII. — No. VI.

DECEMBER, 1887.

COLUMBUS, OHIO:
LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN OF THE OHIO SYNOD.

1887.



COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

VOL. VII.

DECEMBER, 1887.

No. 6.

HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS ON THE EVENTS AND DICTA CONNECTED WITH THE INSTITUTING OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.*

BY REV. B. F. SCHILLINGER.

The Lord's Supper is that institution of the Gospel in which our Lord Jesus draws so exceedingly near us, that He makes Himself receivable by us, not only in a spiritual sense, but in such a manner that we really receive His true and essential body and blood with our mouth, to be eaten and drank for the forgiveness of our sins. There is no other Gospel institution in which the presence of Christ is made so tangible to our natural senses, as it is in the Lord's Supper. By this exaltation of the holy Eucharist, we do not desire to diminish reverence and appreciation of the other Gospel institutions, but we claim that as all the stars are the workmanship of one and the same great Creator, and yet one star differeth from another in glory, 1st Cor. 15, 41; so all the Gospel institutions can have for their Author the same divine Lord, and yet one differ from another in effecting consolation in the penitent soul.

When the soul is thirsting for the forgiveness of sin and desires the unmistakable assurance that God has forgiven it,

*Published by Request of Col. Conf.

the seeing and receiving of the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, will be to it what the returning backwards of the shadow, ten degrees, was to King Hezekiah, and what the wet and then dry fleece was to Gideon, and even more than these, for these external elements in the Sacrament of the Altar are made by divine appointment the veritable communicators of the blessings craved by the penitent soul, and promised by our merciful Lord when He says "This is my body;" "This is my blood" "given" and "shed for many for the remission of sins."

The Lord's Supper seals upon the heart of the believer the desired forgiveness of sins with the precious blood of the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. It is Christ's last will and testament in His blood in which He makes us the lawful owners of the kingdom of God and which He has signed and sealed with His own dear blood.

Since there are such inestimably blessed treasures centered in this holy institution, it is not surprising, that the devout Christian desires to see all the events and dicta clustering around it accord with each other in the most perfect harmony. It is therefore not the object of our present treatise, to discuss the essential doctrines of the nature and object of the holy Eucharist, but to attempt the harmonizing of the acts and declarations recorded by the inspired writings as closely connected with the instituting of this holy feast. May the Lord give us wisdom and knowledge necessary to the completion of this difficult task. But before entering into the discussion of these things, we wish to call attention to the fact, that similarity in dicta and events is not sufficient unmistakably to prove that such dicta and events must have occurred at the same time, and on the same occasion. We must not conclude that the anointing spoken of

by Luke 7, 38, is identical with the anointing spoken of by St. Matt. 26, 7, since the two events are in some things similar. That our position in this respect is correct, is plainly evinced in the case of Saul, where we find the dictum: "Is Saul also among the prophets?" used twice and yet used on entirely different occasions, as every one will see by examining the context 1st Sam. 10; 12 and 19; 24.

We do not presume to be able, in this instance, to give a harmony that will be absolutely incontrovertible; for it is simply impossible for any one to find his way out of the labyrinth into which he is placed, when he undertakes to harmonize all the events and sayings which occurred shortly before, during and shortly after the instituting of the Lord's Supper, as recorded by the holy Evangelists, without assuming certain data, and wherever there are assumptions, however well they may be founded, there will be room for controversy.

Some of our best expositors meet with great difficulty in deciding whether the Sacrament of the Altar was instituted on the evening of the Passover, or on some other evening, and various theories have been evolved concerning this matter; some to prove that the supper, at which the holy Eucharist was instituted, was eaten on the 13th of Nisan and others to show that it was eaten on the 14th. It is held by some that the great body of the Jews had gone wrong in calculating the true Passover-day, and that they had placed it a day too late, and that our Savior ate it on what was then truly the 14th of Nisan, but what then passed for the 13th. "Calvin supposed that on this occasion, though our Savior thought it right to adhere to the true, legal time, the Jews ate their Passover on the 15th of Nisan instead of the 14th to escape from the burden of two days of strict observ-

ance (the day of holy convocation and the weekly Sabbath), coming together." (Smith's Dictionary.) Grotius thought that it was a *πασχα μνημονευτικον* (like the paschal feast of the modern Jews, and such as might have been observed during the Babylonian captivity) not a *πασχα θῦσιμον*. (Smith's Dictionary.)

But we shall not follow these theories any further. We believe the Holy Scriptures to be clear enough on this subject to warrant us in holding the position that the Lord's Supper was instituted on the evening of the Passover.

The main difficulty lies in the record of St. John, given from the first verse of the 13th chapter to the seizing of Christ in Gethsemane. It is admitted by all, that, if we had only the records of the first three Evangelists, the difficulty would not be so great, (though it would not be entirely removed,) but that when we try to draw all that St. John narrates into the same evening, on which the things occurred, which the first three evangelists record, we meet with a disharmony which no human mind can harmonize. But there is nothing in the Gospel of St. John that constrains us to conclude that the supper spoken of by him was the Passover, but on the contrary, the very first clause of the 13th chapter strongly indicates that the Evangelist is speaking of a different feast, as we shall hereafter see. But to get a clear understanding of the case it will be necessary for us to begin with St. John's record in the 12th chap. This starts us six days before the feast of the Passover: that is the 9th of Nisan. On this date and occasion we meet Jesus at a supper in Bethany where Lazarus sat with Him at the table, while Martha served and Mary anointed His feet and wiped them with her hair. Here Judas Iscariot reproved them on account of their extravagance, and Jesus

kindly admonished him on account of his covetousness, and justifies Mary in her act. Next St. Matthew and St. Mark, the former in chap. 21, 6-13, and the latter in chap. 11, 1-9, take up the subject and tell us, that when Jesus came near to Jerusalem, unto Bethphage (St. Mark adds: "and Bethany") He sent two disciples commissioned to bring the ass and the colt, on which He rode triumphantly into Jerusalem. The date when this occurred is found in St. John's narration 12th chap. and 12th verse where he says, "on the next day," that is on the next day after the feast spoken of in the 2nd verse. But since this feast took place "six days before the Passover" which was the 9th of Nisan, and the sending of the disciples occurred the next day, that must have occurred on the 10th of Nisan. In the Gospel of St. Mark 11, 12 we are told that "on the morrow" (that is, the day after His triumphant entrance into Jerusalem), "when they were come from Bethany, He was hungry." Here it was that He cursed the fig-tree,—on the morrow—that is, the day after His entrance into Jerusalem. St. Matthew tells us that it happened "in the morning as He returned to the city." Hence on the evening of the 10th of Nisan He returned to Bethany and on the morning of the 11th again went up to Jerusalem and cursed the fig-tree, on His way.

The 10th of Nisan as we have already seen was Sunday, hence the cursing of the fig-tree occurred on Monday. Now St. Matthew steps in and refers indefinitely to the withering of the fig-tree, chap. 21, verse 9, but St. Mark 11, 15-19 plainly defines the time. He tells us where Christ went to and what He did after He had cursed the fig-tree and then says in the 20th verse: "In the morning as they passed by they saw the fig-tree dried up from the roots." "This was

the next day, after the cursing of the tree had taken place, and must have been Tuesday the 12th of Nisan.

The next account of things occurring at this time, we find in the Gospel of St. Matt. 26, 1-13 and in the Gospel of St. Mark 14, 1-9. Here we find Jesus in Bethany in the house of one Simon the leper, where they made Him a supper and where He was again anointed. We cannot identify this anointing with that which is recorded by St. John, since it is definitely stated, that that anointing took place six days before the feast of the Passover, and that the ointment on that occasion was poured on His feet, while in this case it is clearly stated that this Supper was eaten two days before the feast of the Passover, Mark 14, 1, and that the ointment this time was poured on His head, verse 3. Chrysostomus, Origen and Theophylactus teach, that the anointing performed by Mary the sister of Lazarus, John 12, 3, is not identical with that recorded in Matt. 26, 7 and Mark 14, 3 (see Starke Syn., Matt. 26, 7). Thus we find Jesus on the 12th of Nisan (Tuesday evening) in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper. There is now but one link wanting to bring us to the Passover evening, that is Wednesday, the 13th of Nisan. Here we must remember that, while some of the things occurring at the Supper spoken of in the 13th chap. of St. John's Gospel appear to agree with some of the things recorded by the Evangelists Matthew and Mark, there are at the same time differences and omissions by them, that cannot be accounted for, excepting on the ground of the most unwarranted assumption, when we throw what all of them record on the same evening; but when we consider the supper spoken of by St. John chap. 13 as a feast separate from the Passover, we will have no incongruities to overcome and the omissions will be

more easily accounted for, while the main difficulty will be to account for the similarity of some of the things occurring on these different occasions.

We now begin with the record of St. John in the 13th chap. with the words: "Now before the feast of the Passover." Now it is plain, that by these words he does not mean that the things recorded here occurred a month, or even a week before the feast of the Passover, or he would have defined the time more closely, as he was wont to do, when he wanted to give the reader an idea when a thing occurred, by measuring the time from the Passover. But we also see that when the Evangelists desired to give an idea when an event occurred, by referring to the Passover, and the time was more than a day, one or the other of them stated the case numerically; John 12; Mark 14. But when it was only the day before the Passover, that they wanted to refer to, it was quite natural for them to say: "now before the feast of the Passover," never doubting that all would understand that it was on the day before this feast, and so it would have been understood, were it not for the seeming congruity between things recorded by the other Evangelists, as occurring on the same evening of the Passover, and some of the things recorded by the writer, which took place on the evening of the Passover also. We also have another instance where St. John records an affair as occurring at the time of the feast and where he is very careful to say: "In the last day, that great day of the feast," John 7, 37, and again 7, 14: "Now about the midst of the feast;" while on another occasion where the thing did not occur during the time of the feast, he says, "And the Passover, a feast of the Jews was nigh." 6, 4. Now we believe these instances should convince any one, that St. John would not have

written: "Now before the feast," had he desired to convey the idea, that the things he was about to record happened on the same evening of the feast.

To what we have already said on this subject we will yet add what Starke says on John 13, 1, in his Synopsis. "St. John plainly witnesses that the foot-washing happened at a supper before the feast, and not after the eating of the Passover lamb and the instituting of the Lord's Supper as some do, for this Supper, at which the Passover was eaten, already belonged to the Passover itself, because the Jews counted the days from the evening.

The Evangelists refer to three meals, in this week, of which one took place on Tuesday evening, the other on Wednesday evening, at Bethlehem, and the third on Thursday evening in Jerusalem. Concerning the middle one, it must be remembered, 1) that St. John says, it occurred before the feast of the Passover. That therefore which occurred before the feast of the Passover, could not have taken place on Thursday evening, at which time the feast of the Passover had already begun, when the Passover lamb had to be slain, Luke 22, 7. And although it says, $\pi\rho\delta$, before the feast, which might be understood as meaning any other day previous to the feast, yet it is scarcely creditable that St. John, in Chapter 12, 1, would have said six days before the Passover, and that in this case he would have wanted to describe an indefinite day; but he indicates by this that it took place the day before the Passover, i. e. on Wednesday evening; 2) when as recorded in v. 27 the Lord says to Judas: "That thou doest, do quickly," the other disciples understood this, as though Jesus had said to him that he should purchase what was necessary for the feast. Had this occurred on the evening of the Passover, and at the feast of the Passover,

such a thought could not have entered the heart of so many intelligent disciples; since they would already have eaten the Easter lamb, and according to the law of God they dared purchase nothing on that day.

Besides what Starke here says, it appears unreasonable to us, that Christ and His disciples should first have eaten a meal, and then immediately have eaten the Paschal supper, in which they were expected to eat a whole lamb: and again, if this supper, at which Christ washed the disciples' feet, was eaten on the same evening in which He instituted the Lord's Supper, it appears to us altogether inexplicable, and incompatible with the well known frame of St. John's mind, that he should have dwelt so long on the case of Christ's washing the disciples' feet, which was of minor importance, and that he should have entirely forgotten to refer to the instituting of the Holy Eucharist, a thing of pre-eminent importance. Can it be possible that, in this case, the great theologian got so far out of the line of the general habit of his mind, which on other occasions was only satisfied when it was engaged with the most profound and mysterious subjects?

The difficulty which some find in eliminating the supper, at which the Lord washed His disciples' feet, from the supper eaten at the evening of the Passover lies mainly, first in Christ's reference to His betrayal, (verses 18-30) and secondly in His kind warning given to Peter (verse 38). But this entire difficulty is based upon the assumption, that the Lord referred only once or at least on one occasion to Judas' treachery and St. Peter's denial, and that each of the Evangelists narrate one and the same instance, only in a different form of words. That this objection rests on mere assumption will be seen when we examine the statements

made in the 13th chap. and compare them with those made by the other Evangelists on this subject. A closer examination of these things clearly reveals that Christ did not refer to Judas' treachery only once, even on this occasion, but three well defined times. As though it were something that weighed heavily upon His sacred heart, and which He loathed to dwell upon in conversation, He gives it a cursory notice in the 10th verse, by adding to the words: "And ye are clean", the phrase; "but not all," and then quickly leaves the subject and begins to teach the disciples the meaning of what He had just done to them, but He has scarcely ended these instructions, when He again reverts to His betrayal in the 18th verse, with the words: "He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me," when He again drops the subject, and begins to prepare the disciples for the things which must soon come to pass. Having spoken but a few words, His betrayal forces itself upon His mind the third time, and He speaks out plainly as we see in the 21st verse: "One of you shall betray me." Upon hearing this, the disciples are at first silent, no doubt struck dumb with surprise and sorrow: Peter being the first to recover from the shock, beckons to the disciple, who was leaning on Jesus' bosom, that he should ask who it was. But it was not the object of the Lord, in these references to His betrayal, to reveal the traitor; He only alludes to the crime, for the purpose of awakening in the traitor repentance, if possible, and to cause him to desist from the nefarious work which he had already planned in his mind; and also to let him know that his wicked intentions were not hid from the Lord. Hence the Lord does not name him to the disciples, but simply gives the disciple, who asked Him, a sign, by which he might know who the traitor is; and at

the same time He gives the traitor another word of warning, upon which, instead of repenting, he becomes so embarrassed and embittered, seeing that the Lord is not ignorant of his wicked plan, that he can no longer remain in the presence of the Lord, therefore he goes out, v. 30. Now we have every day from the 6th to the 2d day before the feast clearly defined, and when St. Matthew in chap. 26 begins to record what took place on the evening of Passover, he says: "Now on the first day of the feast."

Hence the record would stop with the second day before the feast and then start again on the first day of the feast and lose one day viz., the day before the feast, unless we understand the $\pi\rho\delta$ as designed to indicate, that the supper noticed by St. John was taken on Wednesday evening, before the evening of the Passover. Again when St. Matthew, 26, 21-25, notices Christ's reference to His betrayal, it bears upon its very face the stamp of a different occasion from that recorded by St. John. For in St. Matthew's statement the Lord speaks more definitely and dwells longer upon the subject, than He did on the occasion spoken of by St. John. There Peter simply beckoned to the disciple leaning on Jesus' bosom, that he should ask the Lord whom He meant, but on this occasion it is expressly stated, that "every one of them" began to say unto Him, "Lord is it I?" On that occasion Judas is not sufficiently hardened to say "Is it I?" but by this time he has become so foolhardy as to think he can make the Lord believe he has no treacherous project in view, and also endeavors to prevent the suspicions of the other disciples from resting upon him, which must have been the case had he remained silent, therefore he also says, "Is it I?" In the record of St. John the sign was given to but one disciple, and it was, that He would dip a sop and

give it to the one who should betray Him, 13, 26; but in the case recorded by St. Matthew the sign was announced to all because all had asked and were anxious, each one fearing it might be himself, and the sign was "he that dippeth his hand with me in the dish," and to Judas He says: "Thou hast said," i. e. Thou art the man. The subject is the same on both occasions, but all the circumstances connected with the treating of it, in the two records, show that it was referred to on two entirely different occasions. The simple fact is that St. John gives us what occurred on Wednesday evening in Bethany, while the other Evangelists record what took place on Thursday evening in Jerusalem. What St. Mark says, 14, 18-21, most beautifully harmonizes with the statements of St. Matthew, but differs just as widely with what St. John says. This only proves the more that what St. John relates did not occur at the same time, or on the same occasion with the acts and dicta narrated by the other two Evangelists.

We now come to discuss the friendly warning the Lord gave to St. Peter, when he manifested such self-dependence, that he thought he could lay down his life for his Lord.

As in the case of Judas so also in this case, the Lord does not refer to St. Peter's fall only once. There are at least two distinct occasions on which He alludes to it. We first find Him referring to it in St. John's record. After Judas had gone out, 13, 30, Jesus addressed Himself to the remaining disciples, for the purpose of further strengthening and comforting them against the fearful things which were lying in the near future. The words spoken by the Lord caused Peter to ask: "Lord whither goest Thou," and Christ's answer to his question gave him occasion to respond: "I will lay down my life for Thy sake," 13, 37. To

this Christ answers: "Verily, Verily, I say unto thee, the cock shall not crow till thou hast denied me thrice." Hence notice, that St. Peter was not speaking of laying down his life at that moment, there was no occasion for it then. His idea was, that, when it became necessary for him to do so, he would strive with the Lord's enemies until the last drop of his blood was shed. In this same sense Jesus also understood it, for this reason He does not say, this night, as in the case recorded by the other disciples, but simply the cock shall not crow, etc., meaning, that at the time when these things of which He had spoken shall begin to take place, then Peter would deny Him thrice ere the cock would crow twice. The expression, the cock shall not etc., must be explained in the same manner as we would explain our Lord's expression in chap. 17, 11, where He says: "And now I am no more in the world" though He was not yet crucified. He speaks in this manner, because the time is so near at hand when He will no longer be visibly in the world. It appears quite reasonable to us that our Lord should speak in this way a day before the time when the thing should occur, but that when the time came, that the things spoken of were about to begin to transpire, He would say in the words of St. Matthew 26, 34: "Verily, I say unto thee, that this night, before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice."

Here again, the whole context shows that these words were not spoken on the same occasion, with that recorded by St. John. Christ's words, which in St. John's record caused Peter to say: "I will lay down my life for Thy sake," can not be considered a simple verbal difference in narrating the same thing. In the case recorded by St. Matthew there is nothing said about laying down the life, but it is about being offended at the Lord, and when Peter

avers that, though all men should be offended at Him, yet he will never be offended, Christ again warns him, definitely stating the time, when the cock would not crow before Peter had thrice denied Him.

We see no difficulty in the different renderings of Matt. Mark and Luke. True Matt. 26, 34, says: "This night" while St. Luke 22, 34, says: "This day" but neither contradicts the other. We need but let St. Mark speak, and the mystery is solved. He says 14, 30: "And Jesus saith unto him, Verily I say unto thee, That this day, even in this night, before the cock crow twice Thou shalt deny me thrice." The Jews were accustomed to call it a day from six o'clock in the evening, to six o'clock the next evening. Matthew says: "this night" because the denial would occur before the sun of a new day would arise. Luke says: "this day," i. e., before six o'clock the following evening, but Mark gives us, no doubt, the full expression, just as Christ Himself stated it and says: "This day, even in this night, etc." Those who have adopted the theory, that the Lord's Supper was instituted on the same evening that Christ washed the disciples' feet, claim that everything recorded by St. John from Chap. 13, 1 to 18, 12, is so closely connected, that it is impossible to see where the events of the one evening should close, and those of the Passover evening should begin, hence, they would put it all on the same evening. We do not find that difficulty; but, on the contrary, it would be difficult for us to find a connection between the last words of the 14th chapter and the beginning of the 15th. There is a line of thought connecting chapters 13 and 14, while 15 and 16 are connected by the phrase: "These things," etc., and 16 and 17 are again connected by: "These words spake Jesus," but what is there between 14 and 15, in thought, or word, that

would constrain any one to think that both of these chapters are a record of things and dicta transpiring on the same occasion. The words: "Arise, let us go hence," are sufficient evidence, that the work of that evening was ended, and St. Matt. 26, 17 takes up the subject of their next meeting by saying: "Now the first day of the feast of unleavened bread," etc. Mark also refers to this case in Chap. 14; 12 and St. Luke in 22d chapter. That which St. John records in chapters 15, 16 and 17 no doubt took place after the Passover had been eaten, and the Lord's Supper had been instituted.

LATEST EVENTS ON THE JEWISH MISSIONARY FIELD AND A CRITICISM UPON THEM.

A discourse held in Plau, Sept. 20, by Rev. Dr. Behm, of Schlieffenberg.*

Honorable Gentlemen and Brethren, Dear Missionary Friends!

The duty has devolved upon me, sad to say, of furnishing you the work of this hour. Not as if I were unwilling to discharge this duty; but it would evidently have been more to the point and therefore more desirable, if missionary Faber, as we hoped, could have spoken to us of his own experiences, imparted information of his labors and given an impulse to ours.

The wishes of the circle of missionary friends in this country have determined the choice of the subject which I will to-day handle. These wishes were directed toward a fuller enlightenment upon the Jewish-Christian movements they have arisen in southern Russia through Joseph Rabinowitzch. Since in the meantime similar movements have

*Trans. by Rev. L. H. Schuh.

sprung up elsewhere, it seems to me to be indicated, that such analagous events of spontaneous approach to Christianity on the part of the Jews, should be taken into account in the consideration of this subject.

With the above mentioned wishes in regard to Rabinowitsch there was evidently coupled a desire to have an opinion as to the fundamental principles of the movements in Christendom called forth by that man. Thus the duty is laid upon me not to be reserved in my judgment. The latter naturally embraces all similar appearances.

The men whose efforts I will touch upon are, besides Joseph Rabinowitsch, Jacob Zebi Scheinmann, and Lichtenstein; the hearths upon which they essayed to kindle a new fire lie in the Jewry of Kischinew in southern Russia, in Tomsk in Siberia, in Tapio-Szele in Hungary.

The name of Rabinowitsch is not a strange one in a comparatively large circle both of Christians and of Jews; his work, the founding of a National-Jewish Christian congregation at Kischinew has not remained unnoticed by one or the other party. Let us first of all look at the facts, which for the most part are already known to you.

As a Jewish lawyer in Kischinew, Rabinowitsch had, for a long time, been forging plans for the betterment of the external condition of his nation and for the improvement of their religious-moral condition. Being a witness of the Jewish persecutions in southern Russia in 1882, he zealously recommended their return to the Holy Land, and sought, by a journey to Palestine, to inform himself as to its possibility. On this journey the remarkable changes in his religious connection appear to have perfected themselves. For after his return home, he began, instead of continuing his Jewish reformatory plans, to proclaim that salvation

could only be found by his people in the believing recognition of Jesus as the Messiah. That the ultimate discontinuance of the political and social oppression of Israel is bound up in the recognition of Jesus he forcibly emphasized in the watch-word he gave out: "The key of the Holy Land lies in the hands of our brother, Jesus."

The influence which Rabinowitsch enjoyed among the people of his nation at Kischinev secured for his preaching in largely attended meetings not a few open ears and hearts. The aim of his efforts from then on lay in the erection of independent Jewish-Christian congregations (after the type of the first Christian congregation at Jerusalem) with the retention of all the old Jewish customs and orders, which harmonized with the New Testament and which under present circumstances could be carried out. The writings of the Old and New Testaments should constitute the fountain and rule of faith. The Jewish Talmud and the past Apostolic development of doctrine by the pagan-Christian Church were both considered unbinding. In regard to the contents of the confession of faith, Rabinowitsch confesses his belief in the one God and Father in heaven, in Christ as the eternal Word of the Father, in the Holy Spirit, but he rejects the doctrine of the divine Trinity in the sense of the Church as a product of pagan-Christian science. Concerning Jesus Christ he teaches that He is the true Messiah, who was born according to prophecy as the Son of David, through the Holy Spirit, of the Virgin Mary, that He suffered, was crucified, dead and buried for our salvation, that He arose from the dead, and sits at the right hand of our Father in heaven, from thence He shall come to judge the world, the quick and the dead, and that He is the King of

the house of Jacob forever and that of His kingdom there shall be no end. The ecclesiastical doctrine of the duality of natures in Christ he rejects as the result of pagan-Christian reasoning. Baptism and the Lord's Supper are recognized as the sacraments and that "according to the example of Christians of true evangelical confession in England and Germany." In respect to the Lord's Supper, Rabinowitsch follows the Lutheran conception, but arranges the celebration of the Holy Supper as a real meal to be held with old-Jewish prayers. In respect to the appropriation of salvation he accepts without reservation justification by faith in Jesus Christ without the deeds of the law. Yet there are to be retained to the national-Jewish Christian congregations circumcision and the keeping of the Sabbath and festival seasons (especially the celebration of the passover) as exercises of a religious-patriotic duty, as a sign and a testimony to all Jewish-Christians of the choosing of the people of God out of and in preference to all other nations.

It is not to be denied that the development of Rabinowitsch into the founder of that Jewish-Christian movement, might make one suspicious of the sincerity of his religious attitude toward Christianity. In this development, as far as the facts make this plain, the real religious question concerning his own personal salvation, does not appear as the first. On the contrary, there appears from the beginning in Rabinowitsch an impulse to be the reformer and benefactor of his people. This became the motive of his thoughts and deeds. And thus one might be led to suspect that his turning to Christianity is the contemplated result of his reformatory ambition, and that the peculiar form of his Jewish-Christian proclamation is only the molding of the gospel, calculated to produce effect. Such thoughts are to be

entirely rejected. In reality no doubt can be entertained as to whether the conversion of Rabinowitsch to Christ is an upright conversion of the heart and whether his peculiar Christian conviction has been gained by an honest study of the Scriptures. To this his life and teaching give an unambiguous testimony.

But what was the further development of things in Kischinew? The concourse at the preaching of Rabinowitsch on the part of the Jews was continued and large. Many hundreds came to hear him. Besides this, many individuals sought instruction in private conference. An endless number of written inquiries and of encouragements were sent to him from every quarter of Jewish dispersion. Naturally there was no want of bitter opposition from circles of his own nation, which did not spare the most hateful suspicions and slander. But it also happened that zealous opponents were gained by the powerful impressions of his animated sermons. The solid nucleus of the congregation was at first formed by the seemingly small number of fifteen persons, members of the family of Joseph Rabinowitsch and his brother. And even this nucleus could not for the present be looked upon as the crystallization point of a congregation; for neither Joseph Rabinowitsch nor any one of these fifteen persons had received holy baptism.

It was an important question what stand the Imperial Russian government would take toward this movement. The question was satisfactorily answered; the government conceded to the congregation; then being formed, the privilege of free right of worship. In addition the government expressed itself that the existing churches should put forth no aggressive influence, but that the given beginning should by its own power develop itself. On Christmas eve, 1884,

the first general service was held in the presence of several hundred Jews. The house of the younger brother of Rabinowitsch was taken and remodeled, so that for the time being room might be obtained for a chapel, a parochial school and its teacher.

We must here remind ourselves that Kischinew was for a considerable time already the scene of a prosperous Jewish missionary activity. For twenty-five years the Evangelical Lutheran Pastor Faltin has there had an extensive sphere of activity. The concourse at his instructions for baptism and for admission to the church was so great that the number of the proselytes is counted by the hundreds. The number would have been still larger had Pastor Faltin not been alone in his labors. In what relation did Rabinowitsch now stand to Rev. Faltin and his work? The inner relation of both was intimate; Rabinowitsch looked up to Pastor Faltin with the greatest respect and reverence; Rev. Faltin on his part permitted Rabinowitsch to have free course, he attended the meetings of the latter and likely spoke in them. Although approaching in many points the confessions of the Lutheran Church, yet externally the congregation of Rabinowitsch, in accordance with its origin, as the church of the Israelites of the New Testament, formed a separate communion. Because the government demanded that the congregation be independent, Rabinowitsch thought that he did not even dare to receive baptism at the hands of Rev. Faltin. On March 24, 1885, he was baptized in Berlin by a North American clergyman, Prof. Mead, not to be taken into the particular church represented by this man, but to be received into the universal church through the unity of baptism.

This is in short the history of the origin of the

National-Jewish Christian Church at Kischinew. How are we to judge the work of Rabinowitsch? It is self-evident that we do not wish to judge the relation of the faith of Rabinowitsch and his followers to their God and Savior. This judgment we commit into the hands of God, and indeed not without the joyful conviction that the Holy Spirit will, in that congregation, through the Word, also work saving faith. What concerns us is, how, from the standpoint of churchly mission, are we to judge the Rabinowitsch efforts to found national-Jewish Christian congregations.

In this respect it appears to me not to be doubtful that grave considerations must be raised against the Kischinew movement. It certainly has a deceptive appearance when Rabinowitsch says: "Just as well as Englishmen and Frenchmen are Christians and yet remain Englishmen and Frenchmen, so well may a Jew be a Christian and yet remain a Jew." However the argument is superficial and invalid. Englishmen and Frenchmen are terms of simple nationality; in the name Jew, nationality and religion are combined. When a Jew becomes a Christian he must simply cease to be a Jew. It is indeed correct, that Rabinowitsch does not ascribe any merit for salvation to the retained religious Jewish customs and rights of circumcision and the keeping of holy days; yet they are to retain the significance of a religious-patriotic duty. Here a thought finds expression, which, since it cannot be justified by Scripture, may also include dangerous consequences; namely, the thought of the continued significance of the Children of Israel under the New Testament as the chosen people of God and a final return and restoration of the chosen people, through Christ, to the possession of the land of their fathers. Of course it is known that this thought is defended as scriptural by many

Christian theologians. Others deny just as firmly that the Holy Scriptures teach it. It must thus at least be said that the hope of the restoration of all Israel has no plain and sure scriptural ground. But what has no plain ground in the Bible can never legitimately be a factor in the establishment of a particular church. Besides there is in this separate position of the national-Jewish-Christian congregation a thought at work which, according to our conviction, is anti-Christian and will become a great danger to that church, namely this, that the national-Jewish-Christian church will arrive at that point where it may take a stone for bread, i. e., it may place its vain hope of ancestry on the restoration of the nation to the promised land, in the place of the humble faith of a sinner in the bread of life, the crucified and risen Jesus Christ.

Viewed from yet another point the Rabinowitsch church founding is historically a new departure, which measured by the correct standard cannot be sanctioned. To justify the proceedings of Rabinowitsch, the tolerance which the Apostle Paul exercised toward Jewish-Christian prejudices, has been cited. Very well, probably one could, by the example of the Apostle Paul, defend the retaining of circumcision and the celebration of festivals as a provisional condescension to the lack of knowledge on the part of proselytes. But a Christian congregation which has been called into existence not as a provisional institution, but with the definite exclusion from the gentile-Christian church, with the marks of Jewish separation, is a formation which, appears to me, has all the apostolic principles against it. To sanction such an institution is nothing else than to separate the one holy catholic church into two parts; one a Gentile-Christian and the other a Jewish-Christian church endowed by a peculiar election.

From all these circumstances the ardent wish arises that the Rabinowitsch movement may finally arise above its self-defined boundaries and empty into the ecclesiastical Jewish mission.

Whatever wishes we may cherish in regard to the further formation of the Kischinew movement—its origin and effects must in all cases serve as a mark, that among the Jews in a higher degree than ever before a receptivity for the Gospel has begun to show itself. The call of Rabinowitsch has produced an echo in every point of scattered Jewry. And what is still more noteworthy is, that among other Jews, as with him, independent developments toward Christianity have lately taken place. Of these a few additional words.

I have already mentioned the name of Jacob Zebi Scheinmann, who has been called the second Rabinowitsch. Scheinmann, a Polish Jew, employed himself with religious questions since his twentieth year. One of his friends, David Levinsohn, one day secretly communicated to him, that he, Levinsohn, had the conviction that none other than Jesus of Nazareth could be the promised Messiah. This conviction took root in Scheinmann's heart, but he spoke to no one about it. Being a man of spotless uprightness he had great confidence among the members of his nation. On account of this confidence the honor was done him to be chosen judge between two contending Rabbis. He was successful in restoring unity, and the joyful end of the proceedings was celebrated with a merry feast.

At this feast Scheinmann, in the course of the conversation, opportunely dared to put the question to the Rabbis and the Chasidim who were present: "Tell me, who is the true Messiah, the son of David, whom we daily expect? It

almost appears to me that He has already come at the time when the second temple was yet standing, and that our fathers killed Him." Scarcely had he spoken these words, when his fellow guests began to rend their clothes and to cry at him as though they would devour him. He was put under the bann. And because his life was endangered, Scheinmann fled. In spite of the enmity persecuting him, he succeeded in settling in the Polish city Lodz under favorable circumstances. But it was not long until the desired opportunity was offered his persecutors to destroy him. A Chasid sold him two forged checks; when Scheinmann wished to collect one at the time it was due, its genuineness was questioned. He handed the checks over to the Russian government to compel his creditors to make payment; but four witnesses appeared against him who swore that he had confessed to them that he with his own hand had forged both checks. The results for this innocent man were two years' imprisonment for further inquiry, and finally banishment to Siberia. Here he first went to Irkutsk, later to Tornsk, lying nearer to Europe, whither he also had his relatives follow him. In Tornsk he received the news of the events in Kischinew, as it happened that documents on the South-Russian movements by Prof. Delitzch and sermons by Rabinowitsch were placed into his hands.

His joy at this discovery was indescribable. "What ecstacy," he wrote to Rabinowitsch, "the two writings have brought me, which are so thoroughly saturated with love, and are so full of zeal for Jesus Christ, our crucified Messiah." "The aim which you follow is the same to which I so much wish to devote my life. But in my situation as a banished person I believed that my convictions must be concealed within me. Now I can no longer keep silent. I feel moved

to become a preacher in the desert of Siberia and to permit the call to enter the hearts of my Israelitish brethren: "Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make His paths straight." Since then Scheinmann is holding meetings and conferences with Jews, he is spreading Christian pamphlets which he receives from Kischinew, also Hebrew New Testaments and pamphlets written by himself. He can tell of success among his nation. He even tells of a Rabbi at a certain place, who in the midst of the Jewish congregation gathered at Pentecost, cried out: "House of Jacob, come and let us walk in the light of the Lord, in the light of Jesus of Nazareth, who was crucified at Jerusalem." In one of his pamphlets Scheinmann acknowledges: "In vain do Israel's physicians seek a healing remedy; in vain one expects that the sick, like the somnambulist, will indicate the origin and remedy of the disease; the crime of our fathers who crucified the Messiah of God rests upon us. And only repentant faith in the only Son of God, in the Lamb of God, through whose wounds the world has healing, only this faith can remove the burden of our transgressions." At another time he exhorts: "Receive the New Testament, the true Thora, which Jesus Christ, our Lord, the Son of God, has taught us, and meditate therein day and night, there you will find the germ of everlasting life. All our salvation depends on this one point, to acknowledge with all our heart and with souls longing for salvation, Jesus, our Messiah."

Who would doubt that the love of Jesus has heaped fiery coals upon the head of this confessor in Israel? Such fiery coals upon an Israelitish head and in an Israelitish heart—may they not die out in a little Jewish-Christian sectarian congregation. Would that the Jewish mission of the church could gather them up and carry them to the common hearth and altar of the church of the pure Gospel!

To the confessions for Christ of the lawyer Rabinowitsch and the merchant Scheinmann, there must finally be added the testimony for Christ, independently developed, of the Hungarian district Rabbi, Lichtenstein. In three writings he has, since 1886, given his views. He appeals especially to the rising Jewish generation. The most prominent of these writings is the record entitled: "My Testimony!" In this Lichtenstein seeks to prove that Christianity is nothing else than the fulfilment of religious and moral truths, known through Judaism. "As the ocean receives all streams and rivers into itself," confesses Lichtenstein, "so we find all divine attributes united in heavenly harmony in Jesus Christ," of whom Moses prophesying says: "A prophet like unto me, etc. Christ is the foundation of truth, the glorious celestial treasure, the glorious crown of creation, the most exalted human being ever having lived upon earth, the incarnate righteousness, the Savior of the world and its Messiah." Lichtenstein points to the Gospel of Jesus Christ as the anchor of safety for Israel whose future is portentous. He does not, however, wish unconditionally to substitute Christianity in the place of Judaism. While he looks upon Christ as the fulfilment of the Law, he thinks that only by acknowledging Christ one is enabled to serve the Law well. As opposed to the incompleteness of all Jewish reforms, he sets up the alternative: "Either be true to the Law, or serve Christ by totally abandoning Judaism."

What thus far is especially lacking in the confessions of Lichtenstein is the experience of the high-priestly signification of Christ. Nevertheless, what a significant fact that a Rabbi fervently calls souls to Christ! A new reminder that it is our Christian duty to permit ourselves to be exhorted to a pure confession of Christ over against Israel, by the ever increasing voices of confession in the desert of Juda!

To arouse ourselves from our carelessness in regard to the missionary work among the Jews, permit me to cite the following parable of Rabinowitsch: During the Turko-Russian war, immediately after a battle, two companies of soldiers went out to pick up the wounded and slain from the battle field. At one place they picked up 150 corpses, and the sergeant wrote: 150 slain. An order was given to dig a grave in which these 150 were to be buried. While they were in the act of throwing in the corpses, it became evident that one was yet alive. He cried: "Have mercy on me, I am not dead, I am yet alive." The sergeant responded: "I would like to save you, but your name is on the list of the dead, so nothing can save you, you must be buried."

In general this is exactly our relation to the mission work among the Jews. They are placed on the list of the dead, and that many a one who still lives is buried alive is the fault of Christianity. May the Lord remedy this!

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH.

"Articles of faith are not to be derived from the words and works of the Fathers; for if so, then would we be bound to accept as articles of faith also their customs in such things as meats, raiment, houses, etc., and the way they toyed with the relics of saints. But we have another rule, to wit, that the Word of God establishes articles of faith; and beside this, none other, not even an angel."
Smalk. Art. Mueller's Ed. p. 303.

"We believe, teach and confess, that the only rule and norm, by which all teachings and teachers are to be judged,

is none other whatsoever than the Prophetic and Apostolic writings of the Old and of the New Testaments Other writings, however, whether of the Fathers or of modern authors, be their names what they may, are in no way to be considered as equal with the Holy Scriptures, but they all are to be subjected to the latter, and be received as witnesses that show how in times after the Fathers, and in other places, the teachings of the Prophets and Apostles were preserved in purity." *Form. Conc.* p. 517.

The Lutheran Church, having drawn her doctrine of the Lord's Supper from the Word of God and believing this to be the only source and rule of faith, would therefore hold fast the truth she has thus received, even were the testimony of all men against her. But this her fidelity to a correct formal principle of truth does not imply that she is indifferent to the teachings of others on the subject. For the sake of the truth itself, for the sake of Church unity, and for the strength and comfort that might be had from doctrinal oneness, she would be glad if Christians always and everywhere had all held, and would now hold, the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper. But this joy is denied her: for in the course of time the doctrine of the real presence is become distinctively Lutheran; and hence, while the Lutheran Church rejoices that this precious truth is hers, yet is her joy mingled with the sorrow that this truth is distinctive—that others refuse to accept it and by their rejection of it cause schism and contention in the Church of Christ.

The question: What did the Church in its earliest days believe and teach on this subject? has, on account of the divisions caused by it, received additional interest and importance. Though the voice of the Church is at no time

normative, yet is it worth a great deal to Christians to know themselves in accord with its teachings; and this, for obvious reasons, is especially true in regard to the Church of the far past. Christians are strengthened in their position on the Word when they find others standing side by side with them on the same foundation. Nor is it unscriptural for them to draw all the comfort and support they can from the faith of their fellow Christians, if but this as well as their own faith be kept in complete subjection to the divine Word; for, with this restriction, are they pointed for their mutual encouragement to the "cloud of witnesses," about them by the Scriptures themselves. See Heb. 12.

In the controversy on the Lord's Supper the testimony of the Fathers, especially of the first two or three centuries, has received considerable attention at all times; but however great the service may be that it has rendered the cause of truth, it must be acknowledged that at the same time it has done little toward bringing to an agreement the contending parties. The fact is that with the introduction of the patristic testimony the points of differences have simply been increased; since the meaning of the old witnesses were themselves made a matter of dispute. And this, as might have been expected: for when no harmony of interpretation can be reached on the clear words of Institution, then, we may be sure, a harmonious interpretation of the Fathers' teaching is, *a priori*, out of the question. And hence it may be said that up to this day, the testimony of the Fathers on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is as much a matter of debate as are the testamentary words of the Lord themselves. The great body of the opponents to the doctrine of the real presence deny that the early Church held that view of the Supper; nevertheless there are exceptions of no mean

importance, such men as *Ebrard, Marheincke, Dorner* and even *Rueckert* conceding that the faith of the Church at that time on the subject in question was, in the main, nearer to that of the Lutheran Church than to that of any other. "That the Church as such believed and believably confessed that the body and blood of the Lord are present in the Sacra-
ment is the unmistakable testimony of history. And to no other doctrine was *churchly* authority ascribed any-
where until the Reformed Church came into existence; and that divergent views were here and there expressed by individual teachers, only shows that the pure doctrine of the Lord's Supper was not as yet fully developed and dogmatically fixed. . . ." *Guericke, K. G. Vol I.*, p. 177.

The first and most important, because the oldest, witness extant on the subject is

IGNATIUS

who lived during the latter half of the first century, and died A. D. 107, or, according to some, 116. He was a pupil of the Apostles, ordained to the ministry by St. Peter, became the bishop of the churches centered in and about Antioch, and is said to have seen the Lord, yea, to be the child referred to Matthew 18, 2. His references to the Supper are the following:—

A. "Let no man deceive himself: if any one be not within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God." 1 *Ep. ad. Eph. V.**

"I have no delight in corruptible food, nor in the pleasures of this life. I desire the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God who

* Unless otherwise indicated, the translations are from "*The Anti-Nicene Fathers*," American, Revised, Edition.

became afterwards of the seed of David and Abraham; and I desire the drink of God, namely, His blood, which is incorruptible love and eternal life."

Ep. ad. Roman. VII., shorter version.

B. "Do ye all come together in common and individually, through grace, in one faith of God the Father, and of Jesus Christ His only-begotten Son, and the first-born of every creature — — —" (longer version)
"breaking one and the same bread, which is the medicine of immortality, and the antidote which prevents us from dying," (both versions) "but a cleansing remedy driving away evil, [which causes] that we should live in God through Jesus Christ."
(long. version). *I. Ep. ad Eph. XX.*

C. Take ye heed, then, to have but one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup to (show forth) the unity of His blood; one altar; as there is one bishop, etc. *Ep. ad Phil. IV. S. V.* Here the longer version reads: "Wherefore I . . . exhort you to have but one faith, and (one kind) of preaching, and one Eucharist. For there is one flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ; and His blood which was shed for us is one; one loaf also is broken to all (the communicants), and one cup is distributed among them all; there is but one altar for the whole Church, and one bishop," etc.

D. "They—to wit, the heretical Docetae—abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, of His goodness, raised up again. Those,

therefore, who speak against this gift of God, incur death in the midst of their disputes (or die disputing). But it were better for them to treat "it with respect, that they also might rise again." Ad Smyrn. VII. s. v. only.

Whether in the two citations given under letter A reference is really had to the Lord's Supper can be determined with certainty neither from the words themselves nor from the context. It is possible that Ignatius here speaks of "the bread of life" as does Christ in John 6, that is, without special reference to its sacramental communication. But the probability is that Ignatius desired "the flesh of Jesus Christ" and "His blood" as these are imparted through the Sacrament; especially would the naming of "the altar" and the necessity of living "within the altar" seem to indicate that the Sacrament of the Altar is meant—and it is so understood by many. *If so, then are the sacramental bread and wine here called the bread and drink of God.*

That by this interpretation no view is attributed to Ignatius that is foreign to his conception of the Supper, is evident from his words under B, where the "one and the same bread" that is broken in the Sacrament is called "the medicine of immortality, and the antidote which prevents us from dying—*ἴνα ἀρτον κλῶντες, δὲστι φάρμακον ἀθανασίας, ἀντιδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθανεῖν.*" It is evident that only he, who believes the sacramental bread to be "the bread of God, the heavenly bread, the bread of life, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, the Son of God," can believably pronounce it to be the medicine of a glorious immortality.

The words under C would seem to say, if not that the one Eucharist is the one flesh and blood of Christ, yet, that by partaking of the one Eucharistic loaf and cup the commun-

cant enters into oneness with Christ, so that here the *unitive efficacy* of the Supper is testified to—"and one cup," not to show forth merely, but "into the unity of His blood;" i. e., that introduces into, etc.

Under D, Ignatius speaks of the docetic gnostics who denied the reality of the divine incarnation, and held that the bodily life and death of our Lord were such in appearance only. On account of this heresy, says Ignatius, these people "abstain from the Eucharist, because they confess not the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ." "That we," to wit, the writer and those written to, "believe and confess the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Savior," is the manifest assumption that underlies the whole statement; and that it is incidentally made, lends all the greater force to it. Besides, no doubt whatever is left here as to the sense in which "the flesh of our Savior" is spoken of—the same flesh "which suffered for our sins and which the Father, in His goodness, raised up again." Hence, it is neither a flesh made of bread nor a blood made of wine, as the Romanists would have it; but it is the true body and blood of our Lord, which Ignatius and the Christians of his time discerned in the Holy Supper — and therefore they could say too, as does St. Paul, that those who speak against this gift, or despise it, perish.

A second witness to the doctrine is

JUSTIN MARTYR,

who was born in Samaria of Gentile parents, and who lived during the first half of the second century, or about A. D. 110-165. Well educated, and a disciple of Socrates and Plato, he was at last converted to Christianity, and sealed his testimony to its

truths by martyrdom. Of the faith and practice of *the Church* at his time as regards the Lord's Supper, he writes:

“There is then brought to the president of the brethren —“or, as others have it, to the one presiding over the brethren” — bread and a cup of wine mixed with water; and he, taking them, gives praise and glory to the Father of the universe, through the name of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, and offers thanks at considerable length for our being counted worthy to receive these gifts at His hands. . . . And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent”—i. e., by saying Amen —“those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water, over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and to those who are absent they carry a portion.” *Apol.* I, LXV. “And this food is called among us *Eὐχαριστία* (the Eucharist), of which no one is allowed to partake but the man who believes that the things which we teach are true, and who has been washed with the washing that is for the remission of sins, and unto regeneration, and who is so living as Christ has enjoined. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but in like manner”—*δι πρόπον*—“as Jesus Christ our Savior, having been made flesh by the Word of God”—*διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ*—“had both flesh and blood for our salvation, so likewise have we been taught that the food which is blessed by the prayer of His word, and from which (food) our blood and flesh by transmutation are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh”—*ἐξεῖνον τοῦ σαρκοῦ*

ποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδαχθημεν εἶναι.

“ For the Apostles, in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have thus delivered unto us what was enjoined upon them; that Jesus took bread, and when He had given thanks, said: ‘This do in remembrance of Me, this is my body;’ and that, after the same manner, having taken the cup and given thanks, He said: ‘This is my blood;’ and gave it to them alone.” Ib. LXVI.

The late *Dr. Krauth*, in his admirable analysis of this passage, says: “Applying here the same simple principle of interpretation, we find, *first*, that the flesh and blood of Christ are the sacramental objects; *second*, that they are distinguished from the bread and wine; *third*, that they are so related to the bread and wine that the reception of the one implies the reception of the other—there is a sacramental unity and identification; *fourth*, that this relation is not produced by the figurative character of bread and wine, as symbols of body and blood, but a relation subsequent to the consecration and produced by it; *fifth*, that a parallel of some kind is instituted between the two natures of Christ, conjoined personally in His incarnation, and the two elements, bread and body, cup and blood, conjoined sacramentally in the Supper. *Sixth*, the antithesis is implied when it is said: That no one may partake of this food among us save he who believeth what is taught among us is true. This means that the rejecter of this doctrine of the Lord’s Supper in common with the rejecter of any other article of faith is disapproved of and excluded from the Communion. Thus, again, is overthrown the false assumption that the ancient church allowed of known conflicting views in regard to the Lord’s Supper. *Seventh*, these words of Justin show that the super-

natural character of the elements in the Supper is dependent upon consecration. He distinctly affirms that only after the Word of God upon them do they possess their character as the flesh and blood of Christ. This alone overthrows the Zwinglian doctrine, for if the bread be the body of Christ symbolically, it is such, as bread, quite independently of any consecration. *Eighth*, Justin expresses the true doctrine of what it is that does consecrate in the Supper; gives the true answer to the question: What is it, by which that which was before mere bread, now becomes, in virtue of a supernatural relation, the body of Christ? He says: That the consecration takes place through the prayer of the word, which is from Him,* i. e., Christ. . . . This may include the Lord's Prayer, but by pre-eminence it expresses the words of the institution, which we know, in fact, constituted an essential part of the earliest liturgies; and St. Justin himself expressly mentions Christ's words as the words used in the consecration, and makes them parallel with the consecrating words used in the mysteries of 'Mithra,' which were a diabolical copy and parody of the Lord's Supper." *Cons. Ref.*, p. 732.

When the declaration, that "the food which is blessed is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh," is so unmistakably clear and strong as it is in the words before us, it may seem entirely superfluous to call attention to the incidental evidence they contain on the same subject; still it appears from the entire *action* described, from the fact that thanks are given to God "for our being counted worthy

†Here the original is—οὕτως καὶ τὴν δὲ εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφὴν,—and Guericke seems to take it as a reference to the Lord's Prayer—„Die durch das Gebet des Vater Unser geweihte Speise.“ Gesch. I. 176.

to receive these gifts," and then from the statement, "not as common bread and common drink do we receive these"—are the believers in this truth, and no others—that Justin and the Church of his day believed and taught the doctrine of the real presence, and that an attempt was even then made already to develop and fix it dogmatically, as his reference to the union of the two natures in the person of Christ plainly shows.

A third witness, and one in full agreement with the preceding is

IRENAEUS,

a pupil of Polycarp, bishop of Lyons, in France, and who lived (about) A. D. 120—202. The passages from this Father bearing on the subject in question, and taken in the order in which they occur in his writings as arranged, are:—

- A. "But how can they be consistent with themselves, (when they say) that the bread over which thanks have been given is the body of their Lord, and the cup His blood, if they do not call Himself the Son of the Creator of the world, that is, His *Word*, through Whom the word fructifies, and the fountains gush forth, and the earth gives first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear?" *Adv. Haer. Book IV. chap. 18, § 4.*
- B. "Then, again, how can they say that the flesh, which is nourished with the body of the Lord and with His blood, goes to corruption, and does not partake of life? But our opinion is in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist in turn establishes our opinion. For we offer to Him His own, announcing consistently the fellowship

and union of the flesh and Spirit. For as the bread, which is produced from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two realities, earthly and heavenly; so also our bodies, when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection to eternity." Ib. § 5.

C. "Vain also are the Ebionites, who do not receive by faith into their soul the union of God and man" i. e. the doctrine of the incarnation. "Therefore do these men reject the commixture of the heavenly wine, and wish it to be water of the world only, not receiving God so as to have union with Him," etc. Ib. B. V. chap. 1, § 3. "But vain in every respect are they who . . . disallow the salvation of the flesh, and treat with contempt its regeneration, maintaining that it is not capable of incorruption. But if this indeed do not attain salvation, then neither did the Lord redeem us with His blood, nor is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of His blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of His body . . . He"—the Lord—"has acknowledged the cup . . . as His own blood, from which He bedews our blood; and the bread . . . He has established as His own body, from which He gives increase to our body." Ib. § 2.

D. "When, therefore, the mingled cup and the manufactured bread receives the Word of God, and the Eucharist of the blood and the body of Christ is made, from which things the substance of our flesh is increased and supported, how can they affirm that the flesh is incapable of receiving the gift of

God, which is life eternal, which (flesh) is nourished from the body and blood of the Lord, and is a member of Him?" "A corn of wheat falling into the earth and becoming decomposed, rises with manifold increase and having received the Word of God, becomes the Eucharist, which is the body and blood of Christ . . ." Ib. §3.

Irenaeus here contends against gnosticism, a philosophy of Heathen, Jewish and Christian elements, which taught the eternity of matter and believed in a psychical being (as distinct from and opposed to the pneumatic Being, i. e. God) and whom they supposed to have formed the universe, and hence to possess and to rule it also. In some cases, as for example in Marcion, the Christian element strongly predominated; and it appears that Irenaeus has to do with people of this class. The argument made against them in the first passage quoted amounts to this: they maintain that the things around us are the product and property of some power inimical to God; and they say that the blessed bread and cup are the body and blood of their Lord.—Now both statements can not be true; they say, and we believe, that the latter is true; and therefore the former is false. The point is, that Irenaeus believes the second statement to be true; hence he here testifies a) that the sacramental bread and wine are the body and blood of Christ, and b) that such they are by virtue of their consecration—"over which thanks have been given."

The second passage—B—is a clear and forcible one, and leaves no room for doubt as to the faith of the Church at that time in regard to the Supper. 1. An earnest of incorruption and of life is given to the flesh (of the Christian) "which is nourished with the body of the Lord and with

His blood." That this nourishment is here conceived to take place not by the mere spiritual partaking of Christ through faith, but by the sacramental eating and drinking, is evident from the entire context which treats of the Eucharist. 2) A parallel is instituted: as the bread of earth, when it receives the invocation, is no longer common bread, so our bodies when they receive the Eucharist, are no longer corruptible; that is, as by the consecration a change of some kind is effected in the bread, so by the Eucharist a change of some kind is wrought in the body of the partaker, and such that it shall rise to life. 3) The effect of "the invocation" is that it "is no longer common bread"—it is still bread, but not common bread; for it now consists "of two realities, earthly"—i. e. the common bread—"and heavenly"—i. e. the "more than common bread."† What this "more" is, there can be little doubt; since just before it is plainly stated that the flesh—of the communicant—is nourished "with the body of the Lord and with His blood." Not only is the real presence here taught, but the transubstantiation fallacy is as clearly disallowed.

If there be any reasonable doubt that by the "heavenly reality" the body and blood of the Lord is meant, all such doubts must give way to the declaration under C., where Irenaeus argues as from fundamental and by Christians generally accepted truths, that the Lord has redeemed us with His blood and that the cup of the Eucharist is the

†The original of these important words are—ἀλλ' ἐυχαριστία ἐξ ὅντος πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανίου—For this same the "Irenai Interpretatio Vetus Latina, which is by some considered more correct than is the Text by John of Damascus, has (Quemadmodum enim qui est a terra panis, percipiens invocationem Dei, jam non communis panis est,) sed Eucharistia, ex duabus rebus constans, terrena et coelesti:—

communion of His blood and the bread which we break is the communion of His body †† . . . and where then he appeals to the Lord's own acknowledgment that the cup, "from which He bedews our blood," is His own blood; and similarly of the bread. In the last passage—D—the above statements are in substance all repeated, to wit: *a*) that by the consecration the earthly elements are made the body and blood of Christ; that hence *b*) the "Eucharist" is the body and blood of Christ; and *c*) that by this sacramental food even the bodies of the partakers are fed unto eternal life.

The next reference (in the order adopted) to the doctrine of the Lord's Supper is by

THEOPHILUS

born about A. D. 115

and bishop of Antioch from A. D. 168–181. He is not quoted here as a witness to the doctrine of the real presence, but because he is, by Calvinists, said to deny that doctrine. Whether this can be said, remains to be seen. Autolycus is a Gentile friend of the bishop, whom the latter endeavors to convert to the Christian faith. To this Autolycus raises all manner of objections, and among others prefers the serious charge that the Christians eat human flesh. In answer to this, Theophilus writes to him, Book III. cap. 4:

"For though yourself prudent, you endure fools gladly.

Otherwise you would not have been moved by senseless men to yield yourself to empty words, and to give credit to the prevalent rumor wherewith godless lips falsely accuse us . . . alleging . . . that we eat human flesh."

††—The *Interpretatio* has: *videlicet nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos, nec calix Eucharistiae communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quemodo frangimus, communicati corporis ejus est.*

To these words the American editor¹ of the Fathers appends the remark: "The body of Christ is human flesh. If, then, it had been the primitive doctrine, that the bread and wine cease to exist in the Eucharist, and are changed into natural flesh and blood, our author could not have resented this charge as 'most barbarous and impious.'" This "reasoning" is manifestly directed against the Romish view of the Supper, but may be intended as a thrust at the Lutheran doctrine as well. If so, the blow falls short of its mark. The Formula of Concord, for example, also resents the charge that Lutherans eat and drink the body and blood of Christ "in a course, fleshly and capernaitic manner."—*N. York Ed.* p. 397—; does it follow from this that Lutherans deny the doctrine of the real presence? No more does it follow that Theophilus, because he repudiates the charge of Christians eating human flesh, did not hold the doctrine of the real presence and that he did not believe that the body and blood of Christ are *sacramentally* received in the Eucharist. The fact is, the bishop nowhere states what is his faith on this subject; but, in all likelihood, he believed as did the Church in his time. Besides it may be remarked here, that, keen as the logic of the above note may seem to be, it yet disregards the important fact that the logic of man does not unconditionally apply to the supernatural.

In the writings of

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA—A. D. 153—217—

there are several references to the Eucharist; but the most of them are mere allusions devoid of doctrinal import. Nor is the one exception on account of its vagueness of much value. With considerable context it reads:

“And the blood of the Lord is twofold. For there is the blood of His flesh, by which we are redeemed from corruption; and the spiritual, that by which we are anointed. And to drink the blood of Jesus, is to become partaker of the Lord’s immortality; the Spirit being the energetic principle of the Word, as blood is of flesh.

Accordingly, as wine is blended with water, so is the Spirit with man. And the one, the mixture of wine and water, nourishes to faith; while the other, the Spirit, conducts to immortality. And the mixture of both—of the water and of the Word—is called Eucharist, renowned and glorious grace; and they who by faith partake of it are sanctified both in body and soul. For the divine mixture, man, the Father’s will has mystically compounded by the Spirit and the Word. For, in truth, the spirit is joined to the soul, which is inspired by it; and the flesh, by reason of which the Word became flesh, to the Word.” *The Instructor. Book II., chap. 2*

Whatever may be the meaning of this obscure language—whether it favors the opinion of those who teach a dynamic presence of the Logos instead of the substantial presence of the Christ incarnate, or not—one thing is certain, to wit: in the view of Clement the Eucharist is the conjunction of two elements, one heavenly and the other earthly; and then, that by the participation the communicant is sanctified both in body and soul. When he says: “to drink the blood of Jesus, is to become partaker of immortality,” the blood referred to is evidently the “twofold” blood, and the meaning intended would seem to be: this blood of the flesh renders us immortal *because* it is the blood of Christ, the Logos—which would be quite correct.

A witness of great weight, but one that has caused much controversy, is that of

TERTULLIAN.

A heathen by birth—born about A. D. 145—he “became a Christian about 185, and a presbyter about 190, officiating according to some in Carthage, to others, in Rome. He died—sad to say, a Montanist—in the second or third decade of the third century. The most important passage of the Lord’s Supper is found in the 40th chap. of his third book *“Against Marcion,”* and which it will be necessary to give almost entire.

A. “Accordingly, of all the festival days of the Jews He (i. e. Christ), chose the passover. In this Moses had declared that there was a sacred mystery: It is the Lord’s passover.^a How earnestly therefore does He manifest the bent of His soul: With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer. When He so earnestly expressed His desire to eat the passover, He considered it *His own feast*; for it would have been unworthy of God to desire to partake of what was not His own.^b Then, having taken the bread and given it to His disciples, He made it His own body, by saying, “This is my body,” that is, the figure of my body. A figure, however, there could not have been, unless there were first a veritable body. An empty thing, or phantom, is incapable of a figure. If

a. The original reads: In hoc enim sacramentum pronuntiarat Moyses: Pascha est Domini.

b. This against Marcion’s docetism, i. e. that the creation or rather the formation of the world is not to be ascribed to God, and hence, that the things “created” are not God’s own.

however, (as Marcion might say), He pretended the bread was His body, because He lacked the truth of bodily substance, it follows that He must have given bread for us.^c “He”—Macion—“did not understand how ancient was this figure of the body of Christ, who said Himself by Jeremiah: “I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to the slaughter, and . . . they devised a device against me, saying, *Let us cast the tree upon His bread*, which means, of course, the cross upon His body. And thus, casting light, as He always did, upon the ancient prophecies, He declared plainly enough what He meant by the *bread*, when He called the bread His own body. He likewise, when mentioning the cup and making the *new* testament to be sealed “in His blood,” affirms the reality of His body In order, however, that you may discover how anciently wine is used as a figure for blood, turn to Isaiah, who asks.”—See Isa. 63, 1. and “the Book of Genesis”—see Gen. 49, 11. . . . “Thus did He now consecrate His blood in wine, who then (by the patriarch) used the figure of wine to describe His blood.”^d

c. —acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit ‘hoc est corpus meum’ dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset nisi veritatis fuisset corpus. Caeterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non passet. Aut si propterea panem corpus sibi finxit, quia corporis carebat veritatei, ergo panem debuit tradere pro nobis.

d. Ita et nunc sauginem suum in vino consecravit, qui tunc vinum in saagine figuravit. The “garments” and “clothes” (in Gen. 49, 11) signified the Lord’s body, and the “wine” and “the blood of grapes” His blood.—And as then He profigured His blood in wine, so does He now consecrate it in wine.

- B. "The flesh, indeed, is washed that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed . . . the flesh feeds on the body and blood of Christ, that the soul likewise may fatten on its God."—*Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur.* De Resur. Carn. cap. 8.
- C. ". . . albeit we may rather understand 'Give us this day our daily bread,' *spiritually*. For *Christ* is our Bread; because Christ is life, and bread is life. 'I am,' said He, 'the Bread of Life'; and a little above, 'The Bread is the Word of the living God, who came down from the heavens.' Then we find, too, that His body is reckoned in bread: 'This is my body.' De Orat. c. 6.—*Tum quod et corpus ejus in pane censetur: hoc est corpus meum—Itaque petendo panem quotidianum perpetuitatem postulamus in Christo et individuitatem a corpore ejus.* "And so, in petitioning for 'daily bread,' we ask for perpetuity in Christ, and indivisibility from His body.
- D. "He"—the 'lost son,' Luke 18—"remembers his Father, God; he returns to Him . . . ; he receives again the pristine 'garment,'—the condition, to wit, which Adam by transgression had lost. The 'ring' also he is then wont to receive for the first time, wherewith, after being interrogated, he publicly seals the agreement of faith, and thus thenceforward feeds upon the 'fatness' of the Lord's body,—the Eucharist, to wit." On Modesty c. 9. The original of the last sentence is: *Annulum quoque accipit hunc primum, quo fidei pactionem interrogatus obsignat, atque ita exinde opimitate Dominici corporis vescitur, Eucharistia scilicet.*

E. "Indeed, up to the present time, He has not disdained the water which the Creator made, where-with He washes His people; nor the oil nor the bread by which He represents His own proper body"—panem, quo ipsum corpus suum repreaes-tat—"thus requiring in His very sacraments the beggarly elements of the Creator." Ag. Marcion. I. c. 14.

Already in Luther's time was the attempt made, especially by Oecolampadius, to make it appear that Tertullian held the "symbolic" view of the Supper; but Luther showed conclusively that that author's writings do not admit of any such interpretation.* On account of his learning generally and especially because he was an ardent advocate of *realism* over against all false idealism in theology, Tertullian's testimony on the Supper is of more than ordinary importance. The claims of the Zwinglians is chiefly based on the extract marked a., with regard to this, note:—

a) Supposing, without admitting, that Tertullian here uses the word *figura* in the sense of type or sign, would that prove that the bread is nothing more than a sign? Is not the Eucharistic bread a sign of the body of Christ as well to those who hold it to be the sacramental means communicat-ing that same body, as it is to those who deny this latter? Perhaps no man more often speaks of the bread as the "sign of Christ's body—*das Zeichen Seines Leibes*"—than Luther, the

*Since then similar attempts have been made, nominally one by Dr. A. Neander in his "*Antignosticus. Geist des Tertullian.*" Berlin. 1825. This called forth a new investigation of the whole subject from the pen of Dr. A. G. Rudelbach: "*T's. Lehre vom Abdm.*" See R's. "*Reformation, Lutherthum u. Union.*" Appendix 2—where the matter is thoroughly discussed, and T. is shown to have taught the objective presence.

very man who among the staunch defenders of the objective presence stands foremost and above all. But for *figura corporis* the Zwinglians would have men to read *nuda figura*, which Tertullian does not say; and if he meant to say this, the *onus probandi* rests upon them.

b) That Tertullian, by the word *figura* does not mean an empty sign, is readily shown from the very treatise in which this expression occurs. *Figura*, in Tertullian's use of the term is "the *manifestation* of the thing figurated as *coming into reality*." (See Rudelbach "Lehre" etc.) A sign to him is never an empty thing, nor a thing separate from the reality signified by it; nor is it anything arbitrarily chosen or interpreted. T. in his controversy with Marcion, and in the very chapter in hand, himself defines what he means by *figura* and bases his argument on his conception of the relation of the *figura* to the *thing* or *reality* figurated. And to make himself understood, he refers among other things to the Lord's similitude of the fig-tree, Luke 29. The shooting forth of the tree is not only a sign that summer is nigh at hand, but it is at the same time the *effect* of the summer whose nearness it proclaims. So it is, Tertullian would say, with the O. Test. *figurae* of Christ and Christ their Reality. Hence, he goes on to say, Christ desired to eat the passover not because He hungered after Jewish lamb, but because, being Himself the Lamb led to the slaughter, He desired to *make real* or substantial "*His own feast*," by instituting the Supper, before He suffered. Thus introduced, Tertullian goes on to state, in part what the Lord did to institute "*His own feast*," to wit, *Acceptum panem*, etc. (see above, note c). That, in the mind of Tertullian, the close relation existing between the O. Test. *figurae* and their Messianic fulfillment or realization in the

New, is conceived of as an inviolable one, appears moreover from such statements as this that, e. g., aside from such divine prefigurations or prophecies it would have been an entirely indifferent matter whether the Lord was betrayed or not, and betrayed by a stranger or by a friend, and this again for money or for no money ; but no, an account of the *figurae* given of God long before, Christ *must* be betrayed—betrayed by a “friend”—Ps. 41, 10—for thirty pieces of silver—and these for a potter’s field—Zach. 11, 13. Enough to show

c). in what sense the sacramental bread is, to Tertullian, the *figura* of the body of Christ. The Lord, says T., having taken the bread and given it to His disciples, *made it His own body*, saying, ‘This is my body.’ Why T. adds: ‘*id est, figura corporis mei*’ is, from what he has said before and from the point he desires to make against Marcion, quite plain. The *id est* is not intended to weaken what he has just said, to wit, that the Lord *made* the bread *His body*, but to explain why He made the *bread*—and not some other thing—*His body*. T. himself a little further on explains, asking: “But why (did the Lord) call His body *bread*, and not rather (some other edible thing, say) melon ? . . He (Marcion) did not understand how ancient was this *figura*,” in other words, that God already in the Old Covenant had made *bread* the *figura* of Christ’s body. (Of this more anon.) The sense, then, of “*id est, figura corporis mei*,” is: the New Test. sacramental bread is the Old Test. figure of Christ’s body made real. If not,

d). Observe the absurdity to which the Zwinglian interpretation leads; for this makes Tertullian say: what *had been* throughout the Old Test. Covenant the sign of the body

of Christ, *is*, in the institution of the sacrament of the New Test. by Christ *made* the sign of His body!!!

e) "How ancient was the figure," Marcion did not understand; and so Tertullian cites the Old Testament to show that the body was of old the figure of the body of Christ, and the wine the figurae of His blood—Jer. 11, 19 and Gen. 49, 11; Isa. 43, 1. This done, he says: "He"—the Lord, namely, as the *Illuminator antiquitatum*—"declared plainly enough what He meant by the bread" (in the sacrament) "when" (in the institution of the sacrament.) "He called the bread His own body." So again: "Thus did He *now consecrate His blood in wine* who then" (in the O. Cov.) "used the wine to describe His blood." Moreover, a parallel to this passage, as far as it pertains to the bread, is found in Book III. chap. 19, and reads: "This tree it is which Jeremiah likewise gives you intimation of, when he prophesies to the Jews, who should say, 'Come, let us destroy the tree with the fruit (the bread) thereof,' (Jer. 11, 29), that is, His body. "For so did God in your own Gospel" (St. Luke, received with special favor by the Marcionites) "even reveal the sense, when He called" (i. e. in the words of the Institution) "His body *bread*" (should read: the bread His body); "so that, for the time to come, you may understand that *He has given to His body the figure of bread*, whose body the prophet of old figuratively turned into bread, the Lord Himself designing to give by and by the interpretation of the mystery." On this Dr. Krauth says: "Jeremiah calls Christ's true body, which was to have the cross laid on it, *bread*. Why? Because, replies T., there was to be a bread which was to be Christ's true body. Jeremiah calls that bread which was true body—and Christ opens the mystery by declaring that there is a bread, to wit, the Eucharistic bread—which is His

true body, ‘assigning to bread the figure of His body’, as the prophet before had assigned to His body the figure of bread. He identifies the panis of the prophet with the panis of the Communion; and, by consequence, as the panis of the prophet is really the body which was crucified, so is the panis of the Communion really the body which was crucified. That the Calvinistic interpretation is impossible, is very clear. As T. reasons, if the panis in the Supper is not Christ’s body, but the sign of it, then the panis in the prophet would not mean Christ’s body, but would mean the sign of it T.’s whole point is this, what “bread” means in Jeremiah, it is in the Supper.,” Cons. Ref. p. 743.

f) The somewhat difficult sentence, *Aut si propterea*, etc.,—see foot-note c under A, and its English rendering above—is by Rudelbach translated thus: “Or if the Lord formed or made—finxit—the bread a body to Himself, because the bread” (of the Eucharist) “lacked the substance of the body, then the bread must have been given” (crucified) “for us”—since the Lord said, when instituting the Supper, “Which is given for you.” “The sense is this”—says R.—“If that which the Lord distributed to His disciples in the” (sacramental) “bread was not His body, then His words ‘which is given for you’ were devoid of all meaning.”

g) Luther, against Oecolampadius, makes the following points: First, *figura* does not mean a similitude, type or sign but form or shape, such as mathematics has length, breadth, thickness, etc.—and in this its proper sense T. uses it here. If not, Oecolampadius is bound to prove the contrary *Secondly*, Marcion, against whom T. contends, held that the sacramental body had the phantom of a body. Upon this T. argues: “How can Christ’s body be in the bread or have the figure of bread, if it is not a true body, for the phantom

(of a body) can have no figure. Because the *sacramental bread* is the *figura of Christ's body*, i. e., its *form* of communication, therefore is the body of Christ a real one. (Observe that the Zwinglian interpretation destroys T.'s reasoning, depriving the syllogism of its premise.) *Thirdly*, the paragraph under f), just discussed, Luther puts to use thus: "But if such is not the case"—i. e., that the true body of Christ is in the form of bread" "and hence, if Christ has made the bread a phantom of His body, (as thou Marcion mayest say) He having no true body, then you must say, that He has given bread for us to the forgiveness of sins." Whether the reasoning of Tertullian is a valid one, or not, Luther remarks, matters not to us, the point is that he makes the fact, *that the true and real body of Christ is present in the bread*, so that the body has the figure of bread, the basis of his argumentation. Luther's W. xxx. p. 108. Erl. Ed.

Ad B—E. That Tertullian taught the objective presence and the sacramental communication of the true body of Christ, is put beyond all doubt by the statement that "the *flesh feeds on the body and blood* of Christ, that the *soul* likewise may fatten on its God." What is fed on? "The body and blood of Christ." Who feeds? "The flesh"—so "that the soul may fatten," etc. Two points are thus made prominent; first, the eating is a *bodily* and not a spiritual one merely, for the *flesh* eats; secondly, that which is eaten is not the Logos nor some power of the Logos, for this the *flesh* cannot eat; but it is the body of Christ, the true body "given for you." The flesh which does the feeding explains the nature of the food it partakes of—it is not spiritual but bodily food, which again is spiritual in effect.

Under C. Tertullian distinguishes closely between "the

bread" in the sense of John 6, and "the bread" in the sacrament; but he puts the former in relation to the latter, thus: *Tum quod et corpus eius in pane censetur*; *Hoc est corpus meum*. (*Censeri* is here employed by T. in its judicial sense for *esse*. Rudelbach). In harmony with the distinction between the *objects* he then distinguishes between the *effects*: by spiritually eating "the bread of heaven" we have *perpetuity in Christ*;" by sacramentally eating the bread of the Eucharist we have "indivisibility from His *body*." How so? Because here our body (as well as our soul) feeds on the body of Christ (as well as on the Christ).

Quotation D. confirms the statement under B. Besides considering that the story of the prodigal son is a parable, it has been pertinently asked here: If the Lord's Supper is simply a matter of signs and symbols, would Tertullian go to a *parable* in order in this to trace matters of signs and symbols?—In regard to the words under E. it may be said that if it does not appear sufficiently from the context that the *representation* there includes the *reality* of the Lord's body as present, it is put beyond all doubt by what has been said already, that Tertullian held such to be the case. Even *Neander*, says Rudelbach, is forced to make the concession that this Church Father "could hardly have been induced to say that signs are signs *only* of things divine."

CYPRIAN

"the Ignatius of the West," the spiritual son and pupil of Tertullian, and the bishop of the Church at Carthage, was born about A. D. 200, and suffered the death of martyrdom in 258. His testimony on the doctrine of the Supper may be gathered from the following extracts:

A.) ". . . that we may not leave those whom we stir up and exhort to the battle unarmed and naked, but may fortify them with the protection of Christ's body and blood"—communion is to be granted to them. "And as the Eucharist is appointed for this very purpose that it may be a safeguard to the receivers, it is needful that we may arm those whom we wish to be safe against the adversary with the protection of the Lord's abundance. For how do we teach or provoke them to shed *their blood* in confession of His name, if we deny to those who enter on the warfare *the blood of Christ?* Or how do we make them fit for the cup of martyrdom, if we do not first admit them to drink, in the church, the cup of the Lord by the right of communion?" Ep. c. 53. ". . . let us also arm the right hand with the sword of the Spirit, that it may bravely reject the deadly sacrifices; that, mindful of the Eucharist, the *hand* which has *received the Lord's body* may embrace the Lord Himself hereafter to receive from the Lord the reward of heavenly crowns." Ib. c. 55.

B.) "For when Christ says, 'I am the true vine,' the blood of Christ is assuredly not water but wine; *neither can His blood by which we are redeemed and quickened appear to be in the cup, when in the cup there is no wine whereby the blood of Christ is shown forth*, which is declared by the sacrament and testimony of all the Scriptures." . . . "In Genesis, therefore," (Gen. 14, 18), to which C. has referred, . . . "the figure of Christ's sacrifice precedes, namely as ordained in bread and wine; which thing the Lord, *completing and fulfilling*, offered *bread and the cup*

mixed with wine, and so *He* who is the *fulness* of truth fulfilled the truth of the image prefigured." "The treading, also, and pressure of the wine-press, is repeatedly dwelt on" (i. e., by the prophets); "because just as the drinking of wine cannot be attained to unless the bunch of grapes be first trodden and pressed, so neither could we drink the blood of Christ unless Christ had first been trampled upon and pressed, and had first drunk the cup of which He should also give believers to drink." "In which" (i. e., in Math. 26, 28-29) "we find that the cup which the Lord offered was mixed, *and that that was wine which He called His blood*. Whence it appears that *the blood of Christ is not offered if there be no wine in the cup*, nor the Lord's sacrifice celebrated," etc. "The Holy Spirit also is not silent in the Psalms" (23, 5) "on the sacrament of this thing, when He makes mention of the Lord's cup, and says, 'Thy inebriating cup, how excellent it is.' Now, the cup which inebriates is assuredly mingled with wine—and the *cup* of the Lord *in such wine inebriates*, as Noe also was inebriated—but because the intoxication of the Lord's cup and blood is not such as is the intoxication of the world's wine, since the Holy Spirit said in the Psalm, 'Thy inebriating cup,' He added, 'How excellent it is.' " "For if any one offer wine only, *the blood of Christ is dissociated from us*; but if the water be alone, the people are dissociated from Christ." "Just as, on the other hand, the body of the Lord cannot be flour alone or water alone, unless both should be united and joined together and compacted in the mass of

one bread; in which very sacrament our people are shown to be one," etc. Ib. chap. 62. So, again, in chap. 75. "For when the Lord calls bread, which is combined by the union of many grains, *His body* . . . and when He calls the wine, which is pressed from many grapes—His blood, He also signifies our flock linked together by the mingling of a united multitude."

C.) Other, shorter, expressions (and culled from Cons. Ref. by Dr. Krauth): "That bread is made flesh by the omnipotence of the Word." "Those mouths, sanctified by heavenly food—the body and blood of the Lord." (Treat. iii, § 2.) "They dare to profane the holy body of the Lord," by giving it to the impenitent. "As in the person of Christ the humanity was seen and the divinity was hidden, so the divine essence infuses itself ineffably by the visible sacrament." (*Sermon de Sac. Coen.*)

These extracts—and they might be multiplied to fill pages—require no comment. Insisting on the use of wine in the celebration of the Supper, the real presence and actual communication of the body and blood of the Lord are everywhere treated as a matter of course. The drift of thought quite often follows that of Tertullian, his teacher, and their doctrine as to the substance of the sacrament is the same. With what success he urges the necessity of the "mixed" cup, i. e., the use of wine and water, does not enter the present inquiry nor in any way effect the results arrived at.

THE APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS

"are a compilation, the material being derived from sources different in

age . . . It seems to be admitted that the entire work is not later than the fourth century. Dr. Von Drey regards the first six books as of Eastern origin (mainly Syrian) and to be assigned to the second half of the third century." Prof. Riddle in Am. Ed. of the Fathers. On the Supper they say:—

- A. "After this" (the blessing of the people) "let the sacrifice follow, the people standing, and praying silently; and when the oblation has been made, let every rank by itself *partake of the Lord's body and precious blood* in order, and approach with reverence and holy fear, *as to the body of their King.*" ". . . let the door be watched, lest any unbeliever, or one not yet initiated, come in." Book II. sec. 7.
- B. ". . . and offer the acceptable Eucharist, the representative of the royal body of Christ." Book VI. sec. 6. "We also, our Father, thank Thee for the precious blood of Jesus Christ, which was shed for us, and for His precious body, whereof we celebrate this representative, as Himself appointed us, 'to show forth His death'". . . "But if any one not initiated conceal himself, and partake of the same, he eats eternal damnation, because, being not of the faith of Christ, he has partaken of such things as it is not lawful—to his own punishment." Book VII. sec. 2.
- C. "And do Thou accept them," (our offerings of bread and wine), "to the honor of Thy Christ, and send down upon this sacrifice Thine Holy Spirit, that He may show this bread to be the body of Thy Christ, and the cup to be the blood of Thy Christ." . . Then, in the distribution, "let the bishop give the

oblation, saying, *The body of Christ*; and let him that receiveth say, Amen. And let the deacon take the cup; and when he gives it say, *The blood of Christ*, the cup of life, and let him that drinketh say, Amen." Then, after the celebration, the prayer: *Now we have received the precious body and the precious blood of Christ*, let us give thanks to Him who has thought us worthy to partake of these His holy mysteries," etc. Book VIII. sec. 3.

However the authors of these writings may have conceived of the *mode* of it, if indeed they made any efforts in that direction, one thing is certain; they all testify to the objective presence of the Lord's body and blood as also to the actual participation of the divine gifts by the communicants. The fact, that the Supper was celebrated behind closed doors and in the presence of believers only, as is here stated, shows how readily could arise the slander referred to above, that Christians "eat human flesh." A few words from

THE EARLY LITURGIES

must close this article. The *dates* are appended to the several extracts.

- 1). "The *Liturgy of the blessed Apostles*" composed by *St. Adaeus and St. Maris*. (1—2 century).
 - a). "The clemency of Thy grace, O our Lord and God, gives us access to these renowned, holy, *life-giviny*, and divine mysteries, unworthy though we be."
 - b). "We draw nigh O Lord, with true faith, and break with thanksgiving . . . the body and blood of our Life-Giver, Jesus Christ."—
 - c). "Brethren, receive the body of the Son"—

2). “*The Divine Liturgy of St. James the Holy Apostle.*”

a). “. . . . and am unworthy to come into the presence of this Thy holy and spiritual table, *upon which Thy only begotten Son*, and our Lord Jesus Christ, is mystically set forth as a sacrifice for me—”

b). “For the King of kings and Lord of lords, Christ our God, comes forward to be sacrificed, and to be given for food to the faithful”—

c). “Thou hast given us, O God, Thy sanctification in the partaking of the holy body and of the precious blood of Thine only begotten Son, Jesus Christ.”

d). “We thank Thee, O Christ, our God, that Thou hast thought us worthy to be partakers of Thy body and blood, to the forgiveness of sins and everlasting life.”

3). *The Liturgy of St. Mark, the Evangelist.*

“We render thanks to Thee, O Master, Lord our God, for the participation of Thy holy, undefiled, immortal, and heavenly mysteries which Thou hast given us.”

It has been the particular purpose of this collection and discussion of “Testimonies” to show that the primitive—as well as the later—Church taught the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of the Lord in His Supper. The evidence presented is, in fact, incontrovertible and overwhelming; and no scholar with honest pretensions to fair interpretation will venture to set up the claim that the Supper was to the first churches an empty thing, a mere ceremony and no more than an earthly sign and memorial of heavenly substances and events. Though the attempt has been made, and is still made, to show that the ‘presence’ taught was conceived here and there—e. g. by Clement of Alexandria—to be not a substantial but rather a dynamic

presence, yet is the evidence of the doctrine of the substantial presence so preponderating and strong, that even such writers must admit that the general drift of teaching in that early day was that of a real presence and actual communication of the true body and blood of Christ. It is not the intention here either to enter into a discussion concerning the modality of the presence, or to inquire how the Fathers of that time may have reasoned about the sacramental union of the heavenly with the earthly reality ; still a few words about the claims set up by Roman Catholic writers in regard to this feature of the subject may not be out of place here.

It is well known that in the opinion of Roman Catholics the Lord's Supper is a *sacrifice*—a bloodless sacrifice of the bread and wine transubstantiated into the body and blood of the Lord, and this sacrifice offered to God by the priest in behalf of the living and the dead. In their vain endeavors to prove the correctness of their view of the sacrament, they appeal also to the writings of the earliest Church Fathers—and to the superficial investigator, not altogether without success. There are expressions which, if not closely examined, might lead one to think that, in the minds of these ancient writers, the sacrament was viewed as a sacrifice. Thus *Tertullian*, for example, uses the expression *et offers et tinguis et sacerdos tibi es solus—you offer*; i. e. administer communion, and baptize and are priest, alone for yourself." *De Exh. Castit.* C. 7. Similary *Cyprian* uses the word *offerre* without the accusative, and in the sense as T. does—*offerre apud confesores, etc.*, the presbyters "who there *offer*," i. e. celebrate the Eucharist. *Ep. 5, § 2.* *Oxford Ed.* But such passages as these the Romanists hardly refer to—especially not the first, since what is there said is said of the laic; nor have they

any need to cite these, for they have passages to fall back on that seem to prove their view much more strongly. One of the strongest is perhaps the following, also by *Cyprian*: “For if Jesus Christ our Lord and God, is Himself the chief Priest of God the Father, and has first offered Himself a sacrifice to the Father, and has commanded this to be done in commemoration of Himself, certainly that priest truly discharges the office of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did; and he then offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he proceeds to offer it according to what he sees Christ Himself to have offered.” Ep. 62, § 14. Expressions somewhat similar to these have been given above; to understand them, the following points should be noted.

1). In connection with the celebration of the Lord’s Supper the early Church celebrated what were called *Agapae*, or feasts of charity — feasts whereat alms, especially of the produce of the earth, were brought together for the poor of the congregation. E. g. “Remember, O Lord, those who bear fruit and labor honorably in the holy (services) of Thy Church; and those who forget not the poor, the widows, the orphans, the strangers, and the needy; and all who have desired us to remember them in our prayers. Moreover, O Lord, be pleased to remember those who have brought these offerings this day to Thy holy Altar, and for what each one has brought them or with what mind—.” From the Com. Liturgy “of James.” Again: “Thou hast accepted the gifts, offerings, and fruits brought unto Thee as an odor of a sweet spiritual smell, and hast been pleased to sanctify them, and make them perfect, O good One, by the grace of Thy Christ, and by the presence of Thy all-holy Spirit.” Ib.

2). Over those gifts, as well as over the bread and wine used in the Eucharist, thanks were offered to the Lord, the

Creator and Giver of them. (This, it may be, all the more because of the heresy then troubling the Church, to wit: That the creation was not God's act, was unworthy of Him, and that the things of creation did not belong to God, etc.) The whole collection of such gifts was called the *oblation*—that which Charity offered to the poor, and thus to the Lord; and because of the thanks pronounced upon them as well as upon the elements used in the holy Supper, the latter received the name of Eucharist, i. e., thanksgiving.

3). And to the understanding of Cyprian in particular: Cyprian sees in the celebration of the Supper a nuptial union of Christ with Christians or with the Church—*Nuptia*—and hence, the Christian communicant in partaking of the holy Supper at the same time while he receives the body and blood of Christ, gives his whole self also as a living sacrifice to the Lord. Taking in addition to this the fact, that in the passage quoted he contends against the *Aquarians*, i. e., such ascetics as would have water used in the celebration of the supper—and it becomes clear why he speaks as he does. He insists that the administration of the sacrament take place now as it did when it was instituted by Christ himself; and the reason why, in connection with this, he assigns to the administrator a function similar to that of Christ the Chief Priest, is to be explained by the sacrificial elements which he conceived to stand *in close connection* with the Supper, but not as constituting its essence. For further explanation, see his views of the bread and of the mixed cup as symbolic of the union of Christ with Christians, and of Christians among themselves, as given above. The further view, then, that Christians each and all as one body, especially when communing, present themselves a living sacrifice to God, is certainly a beautiful one, and it is scriptural as well.

Alas, that the Church is so divided on this feast of Love divine. Lord Jesus! "Even as the broken bread was scattered over the hills, and was gathered together and became one, so let Thy Church be gathered together from the ends of the earth into Thy kingdom; for Thine is the glory and power through Jesus Christ for ever." "*Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.*"

C. H. L. S.

A MOVEMENT THAT NEEDS WATCHING.

We mean the movement of the "National Reform Association" and its Allies.

"THE OBJECT

of this Society shall be to maintain existing Christian features in the American Government; to promote needed reforms in the action of the Government touching the Sabbath, the institution of the Family, the religious element in Education, the Oath, and Public Morality as effected by the Liquor Traffic and other kindred evils; and to secure such an Amendment to the Constitution of the United States as will declare the Nation's allegiance to Jesus Christ and its acceptance of the moral laws of the Christian religion, and so indicate that this is a Christian nation, and place all the Christian laws, institutions, and usages of our Government on an undeniable legal basis in the fundamental law of the land." *Art. II. of its Constitution.*

ITS STRENGTH.

An idea of this may be gathered from the fact that in 1886 it counted among its vice presidents alone not less than seventy-five Reverends of various denominations, and some

of them of considerable repute; then five Professors and thirteen Presidents of Colleges; and lastly, twenty-five "Honorables" including many judges of the highest courts in the States. To this add the influence wielded by

ITS ALLIES.

Among these are to be counted "The Church of the United Brethren," The United Presbyterian Church," in part also the "Chautauqua Assembly Management," then "The National Women's Christian Temperance Union," and to some extent, many organizations of the Prohibition Party; then "The Reformed Presbyterian Church" — which has voted from seven to ten thousand dollars for this "cause." That sectarians generally, and especially the Methodists, look with great favor on the Movement, need hardly be mentioned. Besides its agents or agitators, the Association has

ITS ORGANS.

These are, by express declaration, "*The Christian Statesman*," and "*The Christian Nation*"; besides these, many other papers, for example, "*The Christian Cynosure*," do very much to support the enterprise.

Of the dangerous character of this Movement, Lutherans need not to be advised; but let them be on their guard betimes, lest their most precious liberty be taken from them.

C. H. L. S.

SPECIAL NOTICE.

As this No. closes Vol. VII. of the MAGAZINE, we hope that all who are in arrears will send us the Subscription price of \$2.00 per year promptly.

J. L. TRAUGER, MANAGER.

INDEX TO VOLUME VII.

NO. 1.

	Page.
The New Theology, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	1
Church Authority, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D.....	20
Capital and Labor, by Prof. Theo Mees	44
Mission Work among the Jews, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D...	57

NO. 2.

The New Theology, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette... ..	65
The Union of Church and State, by Prof. F. W. Stellhorn.....	97
The Old Testament in the Light of the New, translated by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D.. ..	107

NO. 3.

The New Theology, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette...	129
Reason: Its Place in the Kingdom of Nature and Grace, by Rev. M. H. Hockman	151
The Use of Excitation in Discourse, by Prof. M. Loy, D. D.....	161
Art in Public Worship, translated by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..	172

NO. 4.

The Word We Preach, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	193
Ambition, by Rev. O. S. Oglesby.....	203
Art in Public Worship, translated by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D..	213
Some Qualities of Effective Preaching.....	247

NO. 5.

That the Man of God may be Perfect, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette..	321
The Historic Churches of the East, by Prof. G. H. Schodde, Ph. D.....	345
Martha and Mary, (from the German) by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette ..	355
A Complete Life, by J. Ker, (from the Expositor).....	367
Homiletical.....	383

NO. 6.

Harmony of the Gospels, Etc., by Rev. B. F. Schillinger.....	385
Latest Events upon the Jewish Missionary Work, Etc., trans- lated by Rev. L. H. Schuh	399
The Doctrine of the Real Presence in the Ante-Nicene Church, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette.....	411
A Movement that Needs Watching, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette....	447

THE COLUMBUS THEOLOGICAL MAGAZINE.

This Magazine is designed to supply the want, long since felt, of a Lutheran periodical devoted to theological discussion. Its aim will be the exposition and defence of the doctrines of the Church as confessed in the Book of Concord. Theology in all its departments is embraced within its scope.

1. The Magazine is published bi-monthly, each number containing 64 pages.

2. The terms are \$2.00 per annum, payable in advance, which includes postage. Single numbers 35 cents.

3. All remittances should be addressed to J. L. Trauger Agent, Columbus, O. All Communications pertaining to the Editorial Department to Prof. C. H. L. Schuette, Columbus, O.

The friends of the Magazine are requested to give such aid in its circulation as their circumstances permit.

CONTENTS OF No. VI.

	PAGE.
1. HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS, ETC., by Rev. B. F. Schillinger.....	385
2. LATEST EVENTS UPON THE JEWISH MISSIONARY WORK, ETC., Translated by Rev. L. H. Schuh.....	399
3. THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE IN THE ANTE-NICENE CHURCH, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette ..	411
4. A MOVEMENT THAT NEEDS WATCHING, by Prof. C. H. L. Schuette ..	447

Monies Received for Volume VII.

Rev. R. Skyberg \$2.00—42. Rev. P. Hein \$1.50—48. Rev. J. Pedersen \$7.00—42. Rev. J. P. Hentz \$2.00—42. Rev. L. F. Meyer \$1.50—42. James M. Leonard \$2.00—48. Rev. G. Rasmussen \$1.00—36. Rev. G. F. H. Meiser \$1.50—48. Rev. G. W. Lose \$2.00—48. Rev. J. M. Koepplin \$1.50—42. Prof. A. W. Lindemann \$6.00—42. Rev. W. Steinmann \$1.50—48. Rev. L. F. Mittler \$1.50—42. Rev. C. E. Herbst \$1.50—42.